DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 337 940 EC 300 682

AUTHOR	Sutherland, Marcia E.; Collins, Beverly
TITLE	Newark School District Evaluation of EHA-B Special Education Projects, 1989-1990.
INSTITUTION	Newark Board of Education, NJ. Office of Planning, Evaluation and Testing.
PUB DATE	90
NOTE	286p.; Some pages of Appendixes contain legibility problems.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC12 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Afterschool Programs; Ancillary School Services; Deafness; *Disabilities; *Early Intervention; Elementary Secondary Education; Minority Groups; Participant Satisfaction; Physical Disabilities; Program Evaluation; Regular and Special Education Relationship; *Remedial Instruction; *School Recreational Programs; Student Evaluation; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Education for All Handicapped Children Act; *New Jersey (Newark)

ABSTRACT

This report evaluates nine supplemental education programs of the Newark (New Jersey) school system receiving funds from the Education of the Handicapped Act--Part B. The projects variously deal with academic, cultural, psychological, social, and service related concerns. Evaluation was conducted through interviews, on-site observation, and examination of academic achievement data. Specific projects addressed the following: occupational training and placement; improved coping and classroom skills of emotionally disturbed students; personnel and parent training; supplemental reading and mathematics instruction; instruction of deaf students in survival skills; preschool intervention; and nonacademic after-school recreational programs for physically disabled, chronically ill, and other handicapped students. Among general recommendations are the following: inclusion of measures of project outcomes in final reports; inclusion of assessment of student satisfaction with project activities; reports which clearly describe all academic tests and students; evidentiary information on student outcomes; adherence to standards on eligibility for project admittance; exploration of innovative instructional practices; improved inservice training; better communication among and between staff members; and establishment of formal communications between project staff and central office staff. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED337940

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

NEWARK SCHOOL DISTRICT

EVALUATION OF EHA-B
SPECIAL EDUCATION PROJECTS
1989-1990

Prepared By

Newark Board of Education
Office of Planning Evaluation & Testing
2 Cedar Street
Newark, New Jersey 07102

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Marcea Sutherland
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC 300682

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This Report was Prepared by:

Marcia E. Sutherland, Ph.D
Research Consultant

and

Beverly Collins
Research Assistant

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We wish to express our deepest appreciation to Mr. Jim Forkan, Supervisor Title VI-B Projects for his kind assistance in facilitating the completion of this evaluation. We are sincerely grateful to the administrators, project coordinators, counsellors, and instructors who graciously met with us and provided information vital for this report. Our thanks to all those students who met with us. Finally, we thank Mrs. Sherleen Hillman for her expedient, diligent and caring efforts in wordprocessing this report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Acknowledgements.......... i

Table of Contents.......... ii

List of Tables.......... iv

Introduction.......... 1

Project Occupational Training and Placement.......... 11

Project COPE.......... 20

Project Personnel and Parent Training.......... 34

Supplemental Reading and Mathematics Projects

- Project Harold Wilson.......... 47
- Project Montgomery
  - Reading Lab.......... 52
  - Math Lab.......... 55
  - The Assessment of Academic Skills.......... 58

Project IDEA.......... 62

Project Intervention.......... 76

Afterschool Programs

- System Success Part A.......... 87
- System Success Part B.......... 92
- Montgomery Victoria.......... 97

Nonevaluated Projects.......... 110

Conclusion.......... 113

References.......... 121

Appendix A: Evaluation Form
Title VI-B Work Program
Occupational Training and Placement.......... 128

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

Page

Appendix B: Occupational Training and Placement Parent Survey 1990 134

Appendix C: New Jersey Administrative Code 6:28 Definitions of Handicapping Conditions 138

Appendix D: Project Montgomery Math Lab-Diagnostic Inventory Charts 146

Appendix E: District-Wide Brigance Test Results 156

Appendix F: Project System Success Rating Form 190

Appendix G: Project System Success Trip Summary Form 194

Appendix H: Project COPE Counselling Form 198

Appendix I: Project Personnel and Parent Training Needs Assessment Results 202

Appendix J: Project Intervention Pre-School Handicapped Location Sites 214

Appendix K: Project Intervention Transitional Kindergarten Location Sites 218

Appendix L: Project Intervention List of Community Agencies 222

Appendix M: Project Intervention Annual Statistics Report 226

Appendix N: Project Intervention Summer Camp Fair Program 230

Appendix O: Nonevaluated Projects 234

Appendix P: The Council for Exceptional Children's Spring 1990 Products and Services 248

Appendix Q: Montgomery Victoria Project SPIB Goals, Domains and Content Areas 272

LIST OF TABLES

Tables Page

Table 1: Description of Title VI-B Flow Through Instructional Projects 1989-1990............ 3

Table 2: Discussion Schedule for 1989-1990 Evaluation of EHA-B Supplemental Special Education Projects................................ 7

Table 3: Percent of Student Displaying Satisfactory Performance on the Evaluation Form Title VI-B Work Program... 15

Table 4: Percent of Parents Responding to the Occupational Training and Placement Survey............... 16

Table 5: Percent of Parents Responding to Project COPE's Survey.................................... 26

Table 6: Percent of Teachers Responding to Project COPE's Survey.................................... 27

Table 7: Reading Performance on the CTBS Project Harold Wilson Participants 1989-1990............. 48

Table 8: Reading Performance on the CTBS Project Montgomery Participants 1989-1990................. 53

Table 9: Mathematic Performance on the CTBS Project Montgomery Participants 1989-1990................. 56

Table 10: Project IDEA Level I Mastery Data.................................... 71

Table 11: Project IDEA Level II Mastery Data................................... 72

Table 12: Project Idea Level III Mastery Data.................................. 74

Table 13: Project Montgomery Victoria T-Test Comparisons on Social and Pre-Vocational Battery Test for Participating Students.................................. 102

Table 14: Project Montgomery Victoria T-Test Comparisons for Participants Classified as Emotionally Disturbed...................... 104

Table 15: Project Montgomery Victoria
T-Test Comparisons for Participants
Classified as Educable Mentally Retarded.................. 105

Table 16: Project Montgomery Victoria
T-Test Comparisons for Participants
Classified as Perceptually Impaired....................... 106

Table 17: Project Montgomery Victoria
T-Test Comparisons for Participants
Classified as Neurologically Impaired..................... 107

Evaluation of EHA-B
Supplemental Special Education Projects
1989-1990

Introduction

In 1977, the Federal Government implemented Public Law 94-142, the Education for all Handicapped Children Act (EHA). This compulsory special education law mandated that in order to receive federal funds, beginning in September 1978, all public schools would have to identify and ensure special education services to all students with emotional, developmental or physical disabilities.

PL 94-142 provided for:

1. Nondiscriminatory and multidisciplinary assessment of education needs.
2. Parental involvement in developing the child's educational program.
3. Education in an environment suited to individual needs.
4. An individualized education plan (I.E.P.).[1]

State education departments and local education agencies (LEAs) have developed guidelines and procedures in providing special education to handicapped students. Within the context of the New Jersey Department of Education regulations, a handicapped child means "a child age 3-21, evaluated per current statutes as being mentally retarded, visually handicapped (including children classified as eligible for speech communication), neurologically or perceptually impaired, orthopedically handicapped, chronically ill, emotionally handicapped, or preschool handicapped." The New Jersey Administrative Code for Special Education (N.J.A.C. 6:28 2.1) further states that EHA-B Flow through Funds "should be used to provide a free appropriate public education for handicapped children with the most severe handicap within each disability who are not presently receiving any education; and to initiate, expand or supplement special education and related services including education services for handicapped children presently receiving educational services." Those funds must also be used to "stimulate the development of comprehensive quality programs and services, to demonstrate innovative practices and procedures and to encourage educational reforms which will enhance the learning potential of handicapped children. These funds are used to support activities which are in addition to, or go beyond, minimal basic types of programs normally provided through state or other funds.[2]

---

[1] The Education for All Handicapped Children Act (PL 94-142), 20 U.S.C. Sec. 1401 et seq. (1975)

During the 1989-1990 academic year, the Newark School District received EHA-B funds for fifteen supplemental education programs for handicapped students. The Division of Pupil Personnel requested that the Office of Planning, Evaluation and Testing conduct an objective evaluation of these projects. Hence, in Spring 1990, the authors of this report began to examine the efficacy and usefulness of several projects. Most important, this evaluation addressed the fundamental issue of the extent to which each project promoted the welfare of students. The projects which were funded are listed in Table 1. As reflected, projects variously dealt with academic, cultural, psychological, social and service - related concerns.

The Evaluation Procedures

In the assessment approach, it was felt to be crucial that the evaluators dialogue with school personnel associated with the projects. Thus, indepth and extended discussions were held with appropriate administrative personnel at the Newark Board of Education. We also talked with student recipients of the supplemental programs, project coordinators and counsellors

---

[2] Guidelines for EHA, Part B Grants. Fiscal Year 1990, New Jersey Dept. of Education Division of Special Education Legislative and Regulatory Authority.

TABLE 1

Description of Title VI-B Flow Through Instructional Projects 1989-1990

PROJECT NAME	PURPOSE OF PROJECT	STUDENTS SERVED (N)	CLASSIFICATION OF STUDENTS*	SCHOOL/LOCATION
COPE	Counselling	230	ED	Camden Elem. Camden Middle Harold Wilson Weequahic Montgomery Samuel Berliner
Harold Wilson	Additional Reading Instruction	39	ED, EMR, CH, NI, PI	Harold Wilson
Montgomery	Additional Reading & Math Instruction	30 33	EMR, PI, NI, ED, MH	Montgomery PreVocational High
Occupational Training & Placement	Vocational Training for the Postschool Workforce.	65	TMR	John F. Kennedy
System Success	After School Recreational, Socialization and Enrichment Program.	32	OH, CI	Part A - Arts High Part B - Barringer High
Project Intervention	Referral, Intake and Placement of Pre-School Handicapped and Transitional Kindergarten Students District-wide.	365	OH, CI, ED	13th Ave JFK School Harold Wilson Abington Boylan Branch Brook Clinton Ave McKinley

(CONT.)

PROJECT NAME	PURPOSE OF PROJECT	STUDENTS SERVED (N)	CLASSIFICATION OF STUDENTS*	SCHOOL/LOCATION
Project IDEA	Increase Awareness, Foster Independence and Responsibility in Profoundly Deaf Students.	29	AH	Bruce St. School for the Deaf Located at GW Carver
Montgomery Victoria	Afterschool Life Skills, Recreation, & Socialization Enrichment Program.	63	EMR, ED, PI, NI	Montgomery PreVocational High
Personnel and Parent Training	Services to Administrators Teachers and Parents.	N/A	N/A	Special Education Media Center at Camden Elem.
Supervision	Supervision of Special Education Teachers.	N/A	N/A	Special Education - Schools District-wide
Bilingual Child Study Team	Evaluation & Placement of the Bilingual Pre-School Handicapped Population.	108	All Special Ed Classifications.	Office of Child Guidance & Placement/ Newark Board of Education
General Aides	Instructional Self-Help Training	N/A	N/A	John F. Kennedy
Instructional Aides	Teacher Assistance	N/A	N/A	
Staff-Up	Monitoring of EHA-B Flow Through Funds	N/A	N/A	N/A

(CONT.)

AH - Auditorily Handicapped

CI - Chronically Ill

CH - Communication Handicapped

ED - Emotionally Disturbed

MH - Multiply Handicapped

NI - Neurologically Impaired

OH - Orthopedically Handicapped

PI - Perceptually Impaired

*** See Appendix C for the NJ Administrative Code which defines each category.**

(see Table 2).

It should be indicated that our visits to project sites provided us with important observational information. We trust that the reader will recognize the essentialness of those visits in informing this year's evaluations. In addition, quantitative assessments of program outcomes were conducted. For instance, statistical tests were performed to assess the participating students' academic proficiency.

In examining the academic achievement data, it should be noted that students were tested on a norm-referenced test, the CTBS, at their functional level of performances. In other projects, teachers developed their own criterion-referenced achievement tests that parallel the curriculum being taught. We have included data from those tests in this report. In other instances, several projects focused on the development and enhancement of students' personal and social skills, and their cultural awareness. We conducted quantitative assessments of students' performance on associated measures. The qualitative and quantitative responses of administrators, parents and teachers to the projects are presented. Finally, we continued the existing practice of relying on the final reports submitted by project coordinators for evaluatory purposes.

Limitations of the Evaluation Report

One must be cognizant of the fact that this evaluation of the supplemental special education programs will be limited on a number of significant and predictable grounds. Of special importance is the premise that the supplemental programs are only one part or element of the broader educational services provided to classified students. Thus, one needs to understand the nature of the interface between the supplemental programs and the core developmental program for special education students in the Newark

Table 2

Discussion Schedule for 1989-1990
Evaluation of EHA-B Supplemental Special Education Projects

DATE	PERSONNEL	PROJECT	LOCATION
May 30, 1990	R. Campbell Project Coordinator	System Success	Arts High
June 1, 1990	P. Hughes Project Coordinator	Occupational Training & Placement	J. F. Kennedy
June 6, 1990	A. White Project Coordinator	Personnel and Parent Training	Special Ed. Media Center at Camden Elem.
June 6, 1990	M. Moye Project Coordinator	Montgomery Victoria	Montgomery Pre-Vocational School
June 7, 1990	D. Domingo Reading Instructor	Harold Wilson	Harold Wilson
June 7, 1990	P. Brown Reading Instructor B. Costa Math Instructor	Montgomery	Montgomery Pre-Vocational School
June 12, 1990	P. Hamilton	System Success	Barringer High
June 12, 1990	J Calvert	Project IDEA	G. W. Carver
June 13, 1990	Yvonne Smith & Arlene Mara Counselors	Project COPE	Central Office
June 15, 1990	COPE Students	Project COPE	Camden Elem. Camden Middle
June 15, 1990	J. Calvert Project Coordinator	Project IDEA	G. W. Carver
June 22, 1990	Dr. Bernice Poll	Project COPE	Central Office
July, 3, 1990	Dr. D. Mays Professor of Special Education and the Coordinator of the Pre-K Handicapped Program at SUNY-Albany		Albany, NY
July 10, 1990	Mr. Manzella - Assistant Director of Special Education	Supervision	Harold Wilson

School District. The absence of such data engenders uncertainties and an incomplete view of issues relevant to this evaluation.

For instance, the assessment of students for special education services occurs in a cultural, legal, political and social context. Public Law 94-142, for one, specifies that students must be assessed before they are declared eligible for special education services. The Child Study Team (CST), a multidisciplinary group, has primary responsibility in this area. The point must be stressed that the students who participated in the supplemental programs under review were initially classified by the CST.

We have seen no documented evidence of the validity and reliability of the CST's assessment procedures and assignment decisions. This is of import in light of the heavy representation of Black and Hispanic students classified as handicapped. While acknowledging that the complexities of this issue go beyond the scope of this evaluation, we continue to experience dissonance because we remain unsure as to the specific approaches and techniques used to classify the participating students. Most significant, it is an open question as to the degree to which the various programs are meeting the individual needs of students. These problems incidentally, are not unique to Newark, but are pervasive in the area of special education.

With respect to the quantitative data shown in this report, in several instances the project coordinators developed and/or utilized their own tools to measure project outcomes. These evaluators had no background information on the approach to scale development. This makes evaluation of research findings based on those measures difficult. We have indicated throughout this report where caution must we exercised in interpreting empirical findings.

Finally, we argue that the time factor placed limits on this evaluation. Activities associated with this year's report began approximately two weeks before classes ended on June 18, 1990. This placed constraints on our ability to engage in a variety of observations and to meet with a wide range of school personnel.

Notwithstanding the aforementioned caveats, we contend that this year's evaluation has sought to provide an objective and extensive examination of the supplemental special education projects. Throughout this report our chief aim was to explore the extent to which each project had attained its stated goals. Recommendations for project improvements are interwoven in the presentation.

SUPPLEMENTAL SPECIAL EDUCATION PROJECTS

SUPPLEMENTAL SPECIAL EDUCATION PROJECTS

Occupational Training and Placement -

Project Coordinator: Ms. Petrine Hughes
Location: John F. Kennedy School

There is research evidence which suggests that of the 300,000 handicapped students who leave high school each year, the majority will experience unemployment (Rusche and Phelps, 1987). Similarly, there has been increased concern on the part of parents, professionals and policy makers on the availability of transitional services for the handicapped (Johnson, Bruininks & Thurlow, 1987).

Efforts to minimize the occupational hazards faced by handicapped youth have been made through federal, state and local school districts. The basic assumption of Project Occupational Training and Placement is that trainable mentally retarded students require a concrete program to ensure successful transition from the self-contained school environment at John F. Kennedy to the mainstream community.

Pertaining to the term "trainable mentally retarded", according to N.J.A.C. 6:28 2.1, "mentally retarded" means cognitive, social and academic functioning which is seriously below age expectations, comprehensive in nature, and demonstrated in home, school and community settings. "Trainable" means a level of cognitive development and adaptable behavior that is severely below age expectations with respect to all of the following:

1 The ability to use symbols in the solution of problems of low complexity.

2 The ability to function socially without direct and close supervision in home, school and community settings.

3 Performance on an individually administered test of intelligence that falls three standard deviations or more below the mean.

In the field of education, the term "trainable mentally retarded" (TMR) defines educability expectations. The person classified as trainable is said to possess an approximate IQ range of 40 to 55 (see Hardman Drew and Egan, 1987). Learning is primarily in the area of self help and vocational skills.

Project Occupational Training and Placement appears to have geared its objectives and activities in line with prevailing educational policies on trainable mentally retarded youth. Hence, in the 1989-1990 request for funds, it was stated that "trainable mentally retarded students more so than "normal" students... need to establish skills at a variety of levels in supervised settings." This past year, the project has attempted to provide 65 classified students, ages 12-21, with the requisite occupational, social and psychoemotional skills needed to achieve and maintain vocational employment. Other objectives for the 1989-1990 academic year provided for:

1. The development of a tentative transition plan for each student.
2. The development of occupational awareness in parents, staff and community of TMR students.
3. Insuring the provision of services of the Division of Developmental Disabilities, Vocational Rehabilitation, and others to parents.
4. The development of vocational independence and social skills in students.
5. The improvement of and maintenance on a daily basis of self help skills in students.
6. The development of positive work habits and attitudes such as calling in, dependability, timeliness, problems solving, and peer relationships in students.
7. The development of consumer skill independence in students.
8. The participation of students in the inschool work program.
9. Ensuring that students obtain summer jobs at J.F.K. and in the wider community.
10. The development of a sheltered workshop at J.F.K.

Our site visit to JFK, and subsequent supportive evidence provided to us, indicated that the project's non-student personnel have attempted to provide a comprehensive service delivery structure and career planning services to students. To illustrate, students attended a Job Expo. They took field trips to a variety of commercial, community and business locations. In addition, students visited government agencies.

Concerning vocational training, beginning at age 14, (45) students were given work experiences throughout JFK school. A small number of students were employed by the Newark Board of Education. Food service skills, however, were stressed this year. A number of students operated the coffee shop and others were lunchroom attendants. In conjunction, to facilitate a successful mainstream life after graduation, students were given exposure to the banking system. They were also taught proper behavior and personal hygienic care.

In a different trajectory of thought, the project staff surveyed students' developmental progress on several academic, social and psychoemotional indicators (see Appendix A). Parental feedback on the project was also assessed (see Appendix B). The findings of these surveys are presented in Table 3 and Table 4.

Research Finding

The Evaluation Form Title VI-B Work Program shown in Appendix A, was used to assess both the students' personal/social skills and their occupational skills. On a dichotomous rating scale, teachers were asked to indicate how satisfactory or unsatisfactory students were on these skills. Teachers' ratings occurred on three occasions separated in time (September 1989, January 1990, and May 1990).

As shown in Appendix A, a subset of items defined a content area. Unfortunately, we have no background information on this scale. Nonetheless, our observations of the students gave us some confidence in accepting the utility of some aspects of the scale for this population.

Data was analyzed on 34 students who had participated in the project. Participants' ages ranged between 12 and 21 years. We are assuming that the students tested were in these age ranges. We caution the reader that crossing so many age levels can seriously inflate estimates of performance on criterion measures. Frequency analyses were done on all variables. Our attempt was to derive a general sense of developmental progress in these students. The results are indicated in Table 3. As shown, the teachers' ratings suggested that students displayed progressive improvements in achieving self awareness, acquiring self confidence, achieving socially responsible behavior, maintaining good interpersonal skills, exhibiting appropriate work habits, and exhibiting sufficient physical manual dexterity.

However, as shown in Appendix A, within each area of improvement, there was variability in the rate of progress. To illustrate, in the area of self awareness, students appeared to have the most difficulty with identifying their emotions. The results showed that at the beginning of the school year, only 29% of the students were able to do so. By the end of the year, approximately 59% of the students had achieved success in this area.

Other problematic areas on the personal/social dimension related to the students' inability to (a) accept criticism (b) to know what personality attributes were needed for acceptance and, (c) to understand the need for goals. Finally, there were unsatisfactory performance levels in reading and writing as determined by teachers' ratings.

Concerning occupational skills, the teachers' ratings indicated that while students made gains in the acquisition of skills, a pattern of unsatisfactory performance is clearly evident. Students were purported to have difficulties in (a) knowing and exploring occupational possibilities, (b) in making realistic occupational choices, and (c) in adjusting to competitive

TABLE 3

Percent of Students Displaying Satisfactory Performance on the Evaluation Form Title VI-B Work Program

Personal Social Skills	Beginning of the School Year	Mid-point in the School Year	End of the School Year
Achieving Self Awareness	54%	68%	77%
Acquiring Self Confidence	37%	47%	61%
Achieving Socially Responsible Behavior	39%	57%	71%
Maintaining Good Interpersonal Skills	35%	56%	66%
Achieving Independence	15%	36%	52%
Achieving Problem Solving Skills	11%	30%	48%
Communicate adequately with others	34%	55%	46%
Occupational Skills			
Knowing and Exploring Occupational Possibilities	15%	29%	42%
Selecting and Planning Occupational Choices	12%	29%	51%
Exhibiting Appropriate Working Habits	34%	52%	70%
Exhibiting Sufficient Physical-Manual Skills	61%	72%	77%
Obtaining a Specific Occupational Skill	7%	18%	30%

standards.

There was a lot of missing data for the general category of occupational skills. It appears that for various reasons, (which are not readily clear to us), several items might not be applicable to all students. One possibility is that the wide range of ages (12-21) might account for the paucity of valid cases for analyses. Here, we are suggesting that personal and social skills appear to possess a wider range of convenience for the population served by the project this year.

Parental Data

The Occupational Training and Placement Survey (see Appendix B) is a 5-item scale designed to assess parental feedback on the project. The findings on this survey are displayed in Table 4. Seventy percent (70%) of the parents stated that there were improvements in their offspring's workskills in the home environment. Parents commented that the project's spillover effects resulted in their son's or daughter's improved performance on household chores.

TABLE 4

Percent of Parents Responding to the Occupational Training and Placement Survey

	YES	NO
Does your son/daughter work at John F. Kennedy School?	82%	15%
Is your son/daughter working at John F. Kennedy School this summer?	56%	37%
Is there an improvement in workskills at home?	70%	22%
Does your son/daughter talk about the John F. Kennedy School work experience at home?	74%	15%

N = 26

From a methodological perspective, the question (item 3) used to elicit parental feedback was skewed in the direction of workskills. Perhaps future surveys will seek to develop more subtle items. Parents might be asked to comment on improvements in the academic, personal, social and psychoemotional domains.

Finally, the survey measured parents' aspirations for their offsprings' work experiences. Content analyses of responses showed that the majority of parents wanted their children to hold vocational jobs including mechanic, stock clerk, cafeteria and assembly work. Other parents were non-specific or had no response to this question.

On-Site Visit

During our visit to John F. Kennedy school, we were taken on a tour of the facility. This allowed us to observe institutional and student dynamics. It was evident that a lot of affirmative efforts had been expended by the project staff to achieve the project's stated objectives. Moreover, the project personnel seemed committed to the philosophical perspective of maximizing the student's human possibilities. For example, emphasis was placed on providing the students with more mainstream job opportunities.

Due to time constraints, we were only able to meet with six students, ages 18-21. They uniformly agreed on how much they liked participating in the project's activities. In response to our question on career aspirations, almost all the students articulated their desire for service related jobs such as cafeteria and custodial work. On the other hand, one student wanted to be a doctor. It was also the case that while the students stated that they would like to read, none admitted to being able to read or to reading well.

We gleaned that the fundamental academic curriculum to which students have been exposed centered on "learning for survival". Among other things, emphasis was placed on learning safety colors and home destination. This functional academic curriculum appears quite prevalent in special education. This curriculum is intended to expand the students' knowledge in daily living, recreation, personal independence, self sufficiency, and vocational skills.

Notwithstanding the restrictiveness of our interview sample, we did not encounter one student who was incapable of responding to a variety of questions posed to assess his or her level of cognitive understanding. For instance, one student was asked the following questions:

(a) Do you know who Martin Luther King was?
Do you know what he stood for?

(b) Do you know who Malcolm X was?
Do you know what he stood for?

(c) Do you know what it means to vote?

The student displayed cognitive grasps of these and other concepts. Where there was no knowledge of a concept, it was introduced and rehearsed with the student by the senior consultant. The student correctly recalled the new information on subsequent testing. We certainly cannot attest to the retention of the new and more complex information in the student. Yet, the point that we wish to make is that some students might benefit from greater exposure to basic academic skills and mainstream educational information. For example, students might be exposed to information in the social sciences. Perhaps, this is one way of broadening their career options. Indeed, previous research findings have demonstrated that severely handicapped persons are capable of learning in many different skill areas. It has been shown that with the use of systematic instruction and behavioral principles and techniques, these persons can make significant progress in the domains of reading (Donnie and Brown, 1977), math (McClennen & Harrington, 1982) and communication skills (Reid & Hurlbut, 1977).

It is also recommended that more direct and objective assessments of students' own perceptions of Project Occupational Training and Placement be conducted. Follow-up tests are also needed to ascertain students' job performance and success in the workforce.

Another important concern is that it was brought to our attention that the students had not been exposed to expert mental health intervention. Historically, teachers and the school principal have been the primary agents for dealing with students' behavioral and emotional problems. The implications of this current practice are beyond this evaluation's boundaries. It must be emphasized however that there appears to be a need for personnel trained to deal with the behavioral problems of this classified population.

PROJECT COPE

Project COPE

Project Counsellors: **J. Fortson**
A. Mara
Y. Smith

Behavior disorders in students are of increasing concern in Special Education. Indeed, statistics furnished by the U.S. Department of Education demonstrated that from 1976 to 1983, the numbers of pupils with behavioral problems grew by 27.9 percent. (U.S. Department of Education, 1985). It is also the case that school programs for behavior disordered youth are in an embryonic stage. Thus, while progress has been made in this area, a significant percentage of youth with behavior disorders are not receiving special intervention programs (Hardman, Drew and Egan, 1987). Traditionally, students classified as emotionally disturbed have been the primary recipients of these programs.

PL 94-142 regulations define emotionally disturbed students as displaying "one or more of the following characteristics over a long period of time and to a marked degree, which adversely affects educational performance: (a) an inability to learn which cannot be explained by intellectual, sensory, or health factors; (b) an inability to build or maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships with peers and teachers; (c) inappropriate types of behavior or feelings under normal circumstances; (d) a general pervasive mood of unhappiness or depression; or (e) a tendency to develop physical symptoms or fears associated with personal or school problems". (Education of Handicapped Children, Federal Register, Section 121a5, 1977). States and local education agencies (LEAs) are responsible for providing services to these classified pupils.

Consistent with federal regulations, according to New Jersey Administrative Code for Special Education (N.J.A.C. 6:28), emotionally disturbed means "the exhibiting of seriously disordered behavior over an extended period of time which adversely affects educational performance and shall be characterized by (a) an inability to build or maintain interpersonal relationships and (b) behaviors inappropriate to the circumstances, a general pervasive mood of depression or the development of physical symptoms or irrational fears. An evaluation by a psychiatrist experienced with working with children is required.

Pertaining to the Newark School District, in excess of three thousand students have been classified as handicapped. As of April 1990, the latest date for which data were available, 724 students had been classified as emotionally disturbed. This is the population which is viewed as being in need of mental health services.

For 1989-1990, Project COPE's primary objective was to provide individual and group counselling for emotionally disturbed students in the school district. Another intent was to provide counselling to these students' parents so as to increase their awareness and understanding of their offspring's school experiences and individual needs. In addition, the project sought to provide consultation relevant to students' individual needs and counselling goals to teachers.

Project COPE's 1990 grant proposal indicated that the above cited interventions would facilitate the following consequences: (a) students receiving therapeutic intervention would display improved coping mechanisms; (b) students receiving intervention would demonstrate improved classroom behaviors; (c) teachers and parents would be assisted in gaining better understanding of students' problems and needs, and in acquiring strategies to implement in working with students, and (d) the school staff would demonstrate increased knowledge of the characteristics and needs of emotionally disturbed students.

To accomplish these objectives, the following activities were proposed. They involved providing consultations with teachers and therapeutic interventions with students. In conjunction, on an ongoing basis, COPE personnel would conduct mental health programs in those classes composed of emotionally disturbed pupils.

Project COPE's 1990 grant proposal had an evaluation component which indicated that data would be obtained from parents, teachers and administrators on the project's effectiveness. Monthly status reports from counsellors were also indicated.

In evaluating Project COPE's 1989-1990 performance, we will critically examine the above mentioned issues. For this task, we have relied heavily on discussions held with counsellors, Dr. Bernice Poll and student participants. In addition, statistical data on the level of satisfaction experienced by administrators, parents, and teachers with Project COPE are included in this report.

Project Evaluation Overview

During the 1989-1990 school year, Project COPE's final report showed that 230 students received COPE counselling. These students were enrolled at Camden Street, Camden Middle, Samuel Berliner, Weequahic, Montgomery, and Harold Wilson. The Project's 1990 Equipment and Performance Report contended that two social workers and one psychologist provided therapeutic intervention services.

Evaluation Findings

The available data suggested that one counsellor saw ninety five (95) students at Samuel Berliner. Another saw sixty four (64) students at Camden Middle, Weequahic and Montgomery. The third Counsellor saw seventy one (71) students at Camden Street and Harold Wilson. The average length of counselling services ranged from four to six months.

Counsellors used a variety of intervention strategies aimed at developing more adaptive behaviors in the students. The major approaches to treatment included individual counselling, group counselling and support group counselling. Two counsellors appeared to have used a multiple treatment strategy. This involved students experiencing both individual and group therapy. In contrast, individual counselling was the dominant mode of therapy for the third counsellor. It would be of interest to discover the reasons for these differences.

Concerning intervention strategies, we were informed that these involved play therapy, films, cognitive techniques and group discussion. Future project reports should provide the considerations which informed the use of a particular treatment approach. For instance, six major therapeutic approaches have been identified for use with children or adolescents. These include play therapy, group therapy, insight oriented therapy, behavior therapy, family therapy and drug therapy. A salient question relates to the factors which channelized Project COPE's utilization of these approaches.

To illustrate, the mental health literature suggests that for young children, play therapy is designed to help them become cognizant of their unconscious attitudes and attendant behaviors. There is a second purpose of play therapy. In that therapeutic context, the child experiences the unconditional positive regard and caring of the adult counsellor. The trusting adult-child interactions developed during play therapy is purported to foster positive therapeutic outcomes.

As indicated earlier, play therapy was used by some COPE counselors. Future reports should strive to demonstrate the therapeutic outcomes associated with play therapy and/or other therapeutic approaches. One way of accomplishing this is simply to assess the students on the criterion measures implied by the intervention strategy. Thus, if one had relied on play therapy, project personnel could assess students' feelings and perceptions of the counsellor. These could take place before, during, and at the end of the counselling session. Furthermore, the relationships between the students' responses to the counsellor's characteristics and the students' therapeutic attitude and behavior outcomes should be demonstrated.

Objective 2.0

Project COPE proposed the provision of services to student participants' parents. It was assumed that this would lead to an increase in parental awareness and understanding of their children's experiences and individual needs.

Evaluation Findings

We saw no sustainable evidence on the type and number of counselling services provided to parents. Table 5 contains the data from Project COPE's parent assessment survey.

It should be recalled that two hundred and thirty students (230) received COPE counselling. We were informed that questionnaires were mailed to all parents. However, the return rate was quite low. We have examined the data provided by twenty-one parents. We caution the reader that this data might not be generalizable to the parent population.

As shown in Table 5, the parents overwhelmingly indicated that COPE counselling had been helpful to their offspring and to themselves. However, fifty percent of the parents stated that they had not acquired understanding of their offspring's behavioral and emotional difficulties.

We concur with the assumption that the input of the family in decreasing the aberrant behaviors of children and adolescents must be considered. In light of the data in Table 5, serious efforts must be directed by Project COPE to uncover the reasons for the findings on parental understanding.

TABLE 5

Percent of Parents Responding to Project COPE'S Survey

	Yes	Maybe	NO
Has the COPE counselling helped you to understand your child's emotional and behavioral difficulties in school.	46%		50%
Has the COPE counsellor been helpful to your child.	73%	9%	9%
Has the COPE counselling been helpful to you	86%		9%

N = 21

Objective 3.0

Project COPE proposed the provision of consultations to teachers on the individual needs and counselling goals of each student. It was hypothesized that teachers would be assisted in gaining understanding of students' problems and needs, and in acquiring the strategies to implement in working with students. Finally, it was proposed that the school staff would demonstrate increased knowledge of the characteristics and needs of students.

Evaluation Findings

It would be useful in the future for Project COPE to provide information on (a) the number of the consultations offered to teachers (b) which teachers received consultation and (c) the specific nature of consultations. Here, we are concerned with issues relevant to the counsellor's role in assisting the teacher to develop classroom management system(s). We are also concerned with

COPE'S work with teachers on behavioral techniques for developing prosocial and adaptive academic and social behaviors in students.

The teacher survey was distributed to approximately thirty five (35) teachers. We received completed questionnaires from thirty-one (31) respondents. As shown in Table 6, the majority of teachers thought COPE services were helpful to students and to themselves. In a similar stream of thought, teachers stated that more COPE services were needed for students.

TABLE 6

Percent of Teachers Responding to Project COPE's Survey

	Yes	Maybe	NO
Do you think the COPE counselling program has provided you helpful information about the student's background and emotional difficulties.	90%		7%
Do you feel the COPE program has been helpful to you as a teacher.	90%		7%
Do you feel the COPE program has been helpful to your students.	90%		7%

N = 31

In addition, Project COPE assessed the perceptions of Principals and Vice Principals. We received four completed questionnaires. The administrators were unanimous in their agreement that Project COPE had been helpful to the students at their school. It was their feeling that the counselling program had been helpful to parents and teachers. These administrators strongly recommended that COPE services be provided five days a week at their institutions.

Student Outcomes

Project COPE's grant proposal stated that students receiving therapeutic intervention would display improvements in coping mechanisms and classroom behaviors.

Evaluation Findings

The Performance and Equipment report failed to directly discuss these student outcomes. They were indirectly assessed through the perceptions of teachers, parents, and teachers. These are subjectively based viewpoints.

We recommend that this project utilize quantitative tools which directly measure changes in the student's coping strategies. A number of coping scales are available in the psychological literature. On the other hand, project personnel may choose to construct their own measures. This is an acceptable practice. However, the measure's psychometric properties must be demonstrated.

With respect to improvements in the students' classroom behaviors, there is no direct evidence in support of this hypothesis. We emphasize the need for empirical tests of proposed findings. Project personnel ought to empirically demonstrate the pupil's maladaptive classroom behavior prior to COPE's intervention. Tests of classroom behavior subsequent to COPE counselling should be empirically verified.

We will now focus on our discussions with the counsellors, students, and Dr Bernice Poll. These discussions were held at the Central Office and at Camden Elementary and Camden Middle schools.

Discussions with Counsellors

During the past academic year, three counsellors were assigned to Project COPE. We met with two of them. Each counsellor provided COPE services to over fifty students. The counsellors expressed the undue difficulties associated with their heavy caseloads. We strongly agree that these caseloads make it humanly impossible to effect therapeutic changes which could lead to positive mental health in the students.

The counsellors pointed out the other problems which had affected them over the past school year. Perhaps, most significantly, the administrative changes which occurred in the Department of Child Guidance. For instance, unlike previous years, in 1989-1990, the counsellors did not report to a single Project Director. Instead, they reported to Assistant Directors who were variously responsible for designated schools. So, if a counsellor were providing services to students at three different schools, it was possible that that counsellor had to report to two different directors. Moreover, dissimilar to the past, the counsellors had no formal meetings. As a result, no formal forum was provided for the counsellors to get together and discuss project related concerns.

The issue of assigning counsellors to schools was another point of contention. It seems that the Office of Child Guidance, independent of any input from counsellors, assigns counsellors to schools, We are certainly aware of the tremendous needs which exist in the school district for counselling services. We also have seen evidence of the profound psychological problems experienced by children served by Project COPE. As we will show in the section dealing with students, these students can hold strong bonding feelings for the counsellors. The severing of the relationship between counsellor-student can be a traumatic event for the child. We recommend that the Office of Child Guidance conducts careful study with the counsellors before making school assignment changes.

Regarding counsellors' competencies, we gathered that the counsellors did not have the resources to attend mental health conferences and to engage in other activities which could develop and enhance their competencies. We believe that these opportunities should be available to them. Funding should be available for counsellors to attend, at minimum, the annual conferences of the Association of Black Psychologists and the American Psychological Association.

Inservice training opportunities should also be available to counsellors and other interested parties. We have contacted the following mental health specialists who are located in the New Jersey region. Each person has expertise on culture and ethnicity in clinical populations. They have also worked with children and adolescents. They are:

Dr. Gwen Childs Jackson	&	Dr. Brenda Times
512 Main Street		Phone# 763-1103
East Orange, NJ 07108		
Phone# 676-5578		

The Office of Child Guidance could also contact Dr. Priscilla Abisola -Galliger, President of the New Jersey Chapter of the Association of Black Psychologists. Phone# 932-7731.

With respect to Hispanic students, and students of other ethnic groups classified as emotionally disturbed, the Office of Child Guidance, and Project COPE personnel should seek the expertise of local or national educators and/or clinicians who are familiar with these populations. They should be invited to present colloquiums and/or offer in-service training to the appropriate persons in the school district.

Concerning other points of discussion, the counsellors expressed their willingness for closer working relationships with the Child Study Teams. They also saw the need for greater coordinated responses to the student needs. For them, this required more counsellors, more parental involvement, greater utilization of the resources of local mental health facilities, and more sensitivity and understanding from administrators on the importance of therapeutic interventions in alleviating deviant behaviors in students.

In concluding our discussion, it is our personal view that more dialogue must occur between counsellors and the administration of the Office of Child

Guidance. We sincerely trust that the counsellors' comments will be addressed by the appropriate staff.

Discussions with students

We met with students who received COPE services at Camden Elementary and Camden Middle. We met the students in the absence of their counsellor.

At Camden Elementary, we met in a group setting with eight students ages six through eleven. The students stated the problems they had experienced because of the emotionally disturbed label assigned to them. According to them, their peers called them crazy.

They mentioned the positive and relaxed feelings they had experienced with the counsellor. They discussed the ease with which they could say anything to her. It was obvious to us that the students had bonded with the mental health provider.

We observed the students for approximately one hour. During that time, we saw displays of the conduct disorders which characterized these classified students. The children exhibited verbal and physical aggression. One student was extremely withdrawn and flatly refused to join the group. Others refused to sit still. It should be remembered that the students were seen by us at the end of the school year. We wish to advocate for closer examination of therapeutic approaches and the individual child.

We met individually with a few students at Camden Middle. These older and more mature students articulated their experiences with Project COPE. The students stressed how important their counsellor had been to them. As one stated, "I feel that she is my mother." They mentioned that they felt sad when the counsellor was absent. According to them, they had no one else who really listened. The students argued that play therapy had implications for reducing their stress levels and improving their academic skills. The students suggested that the attitudinal changes derived from counselling had led to concomitant improvements in their academic performance.

We spent an extended period of time with one student whom we are convinced trusted two people in his young life, the COPE counsellor and his grandmother. This student indicated that his school attendance had improved because of counselling. He also stated that his counsellor had helped him a lot with his academic courses.

Meeting with Dr. Bernice Poll

Discussions were held with Dr. Poll who is credited with the development of Project COPE in this school district. For over ten years she had served as coordinator of this project. Dr. Poll provided useful information on the multiplicity of tests available to the Newark School district for identifying students as emotionally disturbed. There are persistent concerns on the use of these measures, points to which we shall return.

Dr. Poll traced the history of Project COPE. She indicated that in its early history, pretests and posttests were available on the attitudes and behaviors of students. She also indicated that in the past, Project COPE had personnel who were specifically trained to work with certain classified students. She mentioned the efforts of the Office of Child Guidance to attract qualified mental health personnel of various ethnic backgrounds. Finally, she emphasized the necessity for earlier interventions with students and their parents.

The counsellors and Dr. Poll agreed that the school district will see an increase in the number of students requiring therapeutic interventions. This, they predicted, would be accompanied by increases in the severity of disorders. Their predictions are consistent with trends in other inner city school districts. We certainly believe that the Newark school district must possess the requisite resources to meet the future challenges.

Academic Performance

Project COPE's final report suggested that the development of more appropriate behaviors would result in an improvement in the counsellees' overall academic functioning. As we saw earlier, a number of students alluded to improvements in their academic performance as a consequence of COPE services. However, to date, we have only these subjectively derived statements of students.

It is critical to point out that approximately three weeks were spent attempting to produce pretest and posttest academic scores on the students who received COPE services. We were unsuccessful in obtaining enough cases to conduct any meaningful statistical analyses. We have enclosed in Appendix H a copy of the information provided to us by Project COPE on the student participants. As shown, the only information we had to go on was the student's name and school attended. We urge that future reports strive to produce, at minimum, information on the academic measures used to pretest and posttest students. If possible, the student's criterion academic performance levels should be indicated.

In a slightly different vein, according to the project's final report, project personnel worked toward having their "counsellees move to less restrictive environments and ultimately be able to return to regular education programs." Future research findings are required on the extent to which this goal has been attained. Here, it will be important to determine how much value school personnel place on the recommendations of project personnel.

PERSONNEL AND PARENT TRAINING

Personnel and Parent Training

Project Coordinator: Mr. Anthony White
Location: Special Education Media Center

In this project's 1990 application for EHA-B funds, various deficiencies in special education were said to exist in the Newark School District. Project Personnel and Parent Training was to be funded to remedy several deficiencies.

For one, administrators were reported to have a paucity of knowledge on Public Law 94-142. In addition, it was contended that they showed a lack of understanding of administrative responsibility required in the implementation of this Law. Also, the project's proposal concerned itself with special education teachers. One assumption was that these teachers needed exposure to parents and community resources. It was conjectured that this would enhance the teacher's performance in the classroom. Moreover, it was hypothesized that to maximize the potential of each handicapped student, teachers required experiences with a variety of individualized techniques. Another argument was that special education teachers at the Harold Wilson Learning Styles Project required "additional training and coaching in the utilization of five techniques on the Learning Styles Based Instructional Program."

In addition, funds were sought to provide assistance to the Department of Pupil Personnel in identifying the academic growth of classified students. This would be accomplished by increasing the skills of special education teachers in the utilization and implementation of the Brigance Diagnostic Instrument. Finally, parents of classified students were felt to be exhibiting limited understanding of PL 94-142. Funds were requested to rectify these shortcomings.

Evaluation Approach

This evaluation is based heavily on information obtained from discussions with the Project Coordinator. The project is housed in the Special Education Media Center. Thus, we relied on our observations of the Center's resources in evaluating the project. Finally, information presented in the project's final report was used in this evaluation.

In the following discussion, we will first present each stated objective and the proposed associated activities. We will then critically examine the evidence on the project's accomplishments over the past academic year. Recommendations are interwoven in our report.

Objectives 1.0

By June 1990, at least fifty percent (50%) of the regular education administrators will increase their understanding as to their responsibilities in the implementation of PL 94-142.

A survey was slated for development to determine administrators present awareness and knowledge of the law. Workshops were also planned to train administrators who were deficient in certain areas.

Evaluation Findings

We were informed that the Office of Special Education was in possession of survey results. We did not receive these results. What we received from that office dealt with the Comprehensive System of Personal Development Needs Assessment for Spring 1990 (see Appendix I). As indicated in Appendix I, that survey assessed the needs of 283 special education teachers and 24 principals. At the time of writing this report, these evaluators have no knowledge of administrators' awareness of the law prior to project interventions.

The project coordinator provided information which indicated that a workshop titled "Compliance with PL 94-142" was held for administrators on September 27, 1989. Four other workshops were held during October, 1989. Our review of the workshops' evaluation forms showed that participants found the presentations informative.

Yet, it is important to point out at this juncture that project personnel should show concrete evidence of the pervasiveness of purported deficiencies in the school district. We are contending that it is unreasonable to maintain that one will correct fifty (50%) of a problem when there is no evidence to show its pervasiveness in the administrative population. Such critical a priori scientific considerations must be addressed at the level of the grant proposal. In other words, data has to be provided on administrators' understanding of PL 94-142 prior to being exposed to workshops and/or other project interventions. Data also has to be furnished on administrators' understanding of the law subsequent to project interventions.

Objective 2.0

By June 1990, at least fifty percent (50%) of special education teachers in non-center schools will utilize parents and community resources to enhance classroom instruction. A survey was proposed to identify teachers' previous exposure to these resources. An informational booklet and workshops were also proposed.

Evaluation Findings

We gathered from the Project Coordinator that a survey was not developed. However, the booklet is purported to be three quarters completed. According to the Project Coordinator, workshops were not conducted because the booklet is incomplete.

Objective 3.0

By June 1990, at least fifty (50%) of special education teachers in non-center schools identified with student(s)' behavior problems will acquire appropriate techniques for the management of student(s)' behavior.

Evaluation Findings

It was stated in the project's final report that through on-site/in-center technical assistance, the five teacher trainers provided 141 instances of technical assistance in the areas listed below:

Number of Assists	Areas
47	(A) Establishing an environment which encourages self awareness and a positive self concept in students.
38	(B) Developing an appropriate system of rules and consequences.
56	(C) Selecting and implementing appropriate reinforcers.

Before turning our attention to each area, it should be pointed out that we reviewed approximately 410 teacher trainers' summary forms which were provided to us by the project coordinator. These forms dealt with the trainers activities during the past academic year. Relying on these forms, the teacher trainers' met individually with approximately 234 teachers.

The trainers' forms indicated to us that their activities involved:

- providing information to teachers on the Media Center's resources,
- providing educational articles and other instructional resources to teachers,
- observing classroom teaching sessions and assisting teachers in improving their instructional performance,
- providing teachers with information of PL 94-142 guidelines,
- assisting teachers with the physical organization of their classroom environment,
- addressing teachers' complaints to administrative staff members,
- encouraging teachers to attend workshops, and
- attending to various student related concerns.

The trainers' summary forms, the project's grant proposal and its final report do not specify how technical assistance was operationalized. Did it subsume various instructional techniques? If so, what were these techniques? What is the evidence of the techniques' effectiveness. Furthermore, we have no documented evidence on outcome measures which assessed the effectiveness of assistance. This could be achieved in the future by simply surveying the teachers served.

It is our understanding that the services of these five trainers were used in the 1989-1990 fiscal year by Project Supervision. This raises the question of the relationship between both projects. By this we mean that from all appearances these trainers play a prominent role in carrying out the objectives of both projects. Clarification of these relationships is needed. We will now deal with each of the above areas of technical assistance said to be provided by Project Personnel And Parent Training to teachers.

Areas of Technical Assistance

It would have been helpful to know precisely which teachers were experiencing student management problems and the nature of these problems. Moreover, no specific information was provided on the means by which this project successfully improved the teachers' student management skills.

With respect to students' psychological well-being, it was stated that an environment was established "which encourages self awareness and positive self concept in students." There is no evidence presented in support of this claim. Several issues demand attention. We have no information on (a) the students who were experiencing problems with the "self." (b) We do not know the theory or theories relied on in dealing with the various and complex aspects of the self. (c) We do not know what environment is being talked about in this objective. We are assuming that it is the classroom situational context. Working with this premise, we have no knowledge as to why this environment needed to be changed. We also have no insights into what caused the reported change in the environment. There is no data presented to show that the environment did change and that this event impacted the "self concept" and "self awareness" of students.

The above cited concerns are also applicable to claim (c). Here, it was suggested that "an appropriate system of rules and consequences" was developed. We have no knowledge of that system's properties. We do not know why one system was felt to be more appropriate than potential others. On what basis was the selected system's appropriateness derived?

We gathered from the teacher trainers' summary forms that they had provided information to teachers on how to maintain proper student conduct. For instance, teachers were instructed on how and where to post conduct rules. One trainer indicated that these rules covered students (a) keeping their hands and feet together when sitting, (b) raising their hands to indicate their desire to talk and (c) walking quietly in the hallways.

Trainers' statements of the consequences of student misbehaviors dealt with teachers being advised to (a) withdraw the students' privileges and (b) changing classroom seating arrangements.

Pertaining to the selection and implementation of appropriate reinforcers, we saw from the trainers' summary forms that teachers were encouraged to provide positive verbal reinforcers to students. We do not know why these reinforcers were felt to be appropriate for the student population. We also do not know if other types of reinforcers were implemented. Most essential, trainers must show how the implementation of reinforcers impacted the student's behavior.

In brief, it is patently clear that greater specificity and precision, coupled with verifiable measures of activities and outcomes must be presented. In conjunction, in view of the trainers' role in this project, we recommend that they prepare a detailed report of their activities during the academic year. The trainers' reports should be included with this project's final report.

Objective 4.0

By June 1990, at least fifty percent (50%) of the special education teachers in non-center schools identified with needing additional individualized techniques and will acquire a variety of techniques to maximize the potential of each student.

Evaluation Findings

According to the project's final report, this objective was met and completed. It was claimed that through on-site/in-service assistance the teacher trainers provided 876 instances of technical assistance. The issues raised on our evaluation of objective 3.0 (see pages 37-40) are relevant to the objective under discussion.

Given the absence of clear and unambigous data it is difficult to determine the extent of which the objective was accomplished. As it pertains to the 1989-1990 fiscal year, it is not clear when the teachers' needs were assessed. Moreover we have no information on how the teachers benefitted from the project's interventions.

Focusing on the goal of the maximization of every student's potential, no supportive evidence has been provided. First, we do not know of any a priori and objective assessment of the students' level of human potential. We are unaware of any posttest results on students after they had been exposed to these teachers who had received individualized training from the projects' staff. Perhaps, most significantly, it was not made clear why the teachers' experience with individualized techniques would affect the psychological properties of students.

Objective 5.0

By June 1990, at least fifty percent (50%) of the special education teachers will increase their skills on the utilization and implementation of the Brigance Diagnostic instrument.

Evaluation Findings

Information was submitted concerning workshops which took place for special education teachers. These teachers were responsible for administering the Brigance Test to students. The purpose of these workshops was to increase teachers' knowledge and skills in specific areas of this test. Five workshops were held. Each attendee was asked to indicate the degree to which the workshop impacted his or her level of understanding of the Brigance.

The workshop's evaluation form possessed a rating scale with 1 = poor and 5 = very good understanding. Frequency analyses were conducted on attendees' responses to the various workshops. The data is reflected below:

Workshop Date	Location	Number of People in attendance	Participants' Level of understanding of Brigance
January 25, 1990	Samuel L. Berliner	34	4.29
March 7, 1990	Floyd Patterson	6	4.67
March 20, 1990	Montgomery Street	25	4.04
March 22, 1990	Samuel L. Berliner	40	4.38
March 22, 1990	Camden Middle	90	4.21

As shown, the majority of participants noted that their understanding of the Brigance was increased as a function of the workshops.

Objective 6.0

By June 1990, at least seventy-five percent (75%) of the special education teachers at the Harold Wilson school will show additional competencies in the utilization of five (5) techniques on the Learning Styles Based Instructional Program.

Evaluation Findings

This activity did not get off the ground during the past academic year. The project coordinator informed us that this was primarily due to the involvement of project personnel in other activities.

Objective 7.0

By June 1990, at least fifty (50%) of parents of classified students will attain increased knowledge in the following areas.

1. Implementation of PL 94-142 and N.J.A.C. 6:28.
2. Least Restrictive Environment.
3. Individualized Education Program.

Evaluation Findings

The 1990 project grant proposal indicated that a survey was to be developed to determine parents' existing awareness and knowledge of the above mentioned topics. We were informed that a survey was not developed.

The project coordinator provided us with information on the various workshops offered to parents. The Parent Advisory Council for the Handicapped and the Newark Board of Education presented a special education forum on student transportation. This was held on January 18, 1990. Nine parents indicated that they were in attendance. Our review of the workshop's evaluation forms showed that three parents indicated that the forum was useful. Five parents indicated that they were in attendance at the workshop on "Parent and Student Rights Under PL 94-142" held on February 15, 1990 . All parents indicated that the workshop was helpful.

Six parents indicated that they were attendance at the workshop on March

15,1990 on "Parents Participation in the Development of the IEP". The majority of parents saw the workshop as useful.

The Parent Advisory Council for the Handicapped held a mini conference on May 19, 1990 on "Effective School-Parent Relationships". The data provided to us showed that two parents indicated that they were present at the conference. Both saw it as helpful.

On Site Observations

On June 6, 1990 we visited the Special Education Media Center and held discussions with the project coordinator. The center houses Project Personnel and Parent Training. The teacher trainers are also located there.

The Center seems to possess the potential to be of value to the school district. Yet, the issues previously raised, and those which we are about to discuss, suggest several areas for improvement.

The Center's resources appeared to be essential in facilitating the project's objectives. Our cursory view of the Center's physical space and resource holdings indicate that more computer technology is required to improve the project's service delivery system.

Indeed, microcomputer applications are becoming increasingly common in special education. These can be grouped into three broad categories. Computer-assisted management or CAM, computer-assisted instruction or (CAI) and computer-managed instruction or CMI (see Behrmann 1984; Hofmeister and Thorkildsen, 1986).

Computer managed instruction (CMI) seems most germane to the project under review. CMI is defined as... "the systematic control of instruction by the computer. It is characterized by testing, diagnosis, learning prescriptions and thorough record keeping" (Burke, 1982, p.188). Analysis of student performance is one major use of CMI for special education (Behrmann, 1984). Software programs such as Aimstar can assist the project with systematic record keeping procedures. Bennett (1986) indicated that the Goal Based Management System is one of the best CMI Software.

In addition, while we do not know how widespread it is, we learned during our visits to various project sites that project coordinators are buying their own instructional tools such as the System 80. On inquiry, it was reported that the System 80s at the Center are outdated. This points to the need for future assessment of how the project is meeting the teacher's instructional needs. Similarly, while it is outside this evaluation's purviews, we believe that emphasis ought to be placed on the project's cost effectiveness. More specifically, a cost benefit analysis should be conducted which examines the relationship of costs to the benefits resulting from the project's activities.

Finally, we call the reader's attention to the 1988-1989 evaluation of the Special Education Media Center. Several of the objectives in that report mirror those discussed in this 1989-1990 report. It is obvious that difficulties persist in the achievement of objectives. One recommendation is that critical investigation of these trends occur in the future.

SUPPLEMENTAL READING AND MATHEMATICS PROJECTS

Project Harold Wilson

Instructor: Ms Dallas Domingo

In this section we will describe and evaluate the programs which had provided additional reading and mathematical instruction to classified students. These included Project Harold Wilson, a reading laboratory, and Project Montgomery. The latter subsumes reading and mathematics laboratories. Students' eligibility for each laboratory was based on the recommendations of teachers and other school personnel.

Objectives and Associated Activities

Similar to previous years, this project's 1990 grant proposal stated that many classified students at Harold Wilson School required intensified and individualized instruction to attain IEP goals in reading. The other objectives included:

(a) to identify each student's learning style preference and to structure instructional efforts to maximize that strength,

(b) to provide multisensory activities for reinforcement of instruction,

(c) to increase the daily time dedicated for basic skills instruction and,

(d) to prepare academically those students who will return to a regular elementary school.

For the 1989-1990 academic year, forty-seven (47) students ages 7-14, participated in this project. They were classified as educable mentally retarded (EMR), emotionally disturbed (ED), communication handicapped (CH), neurologically impaired (NI), and perceptually impaired (PI) (see Appendix C for definitions of each category).

In small groups, program participants attended the supplemental classes two to three times a week. In addition to this project's services, four students received Chapter I, six students received E.S.L., and ten students received other speech services.

It was reported that the reading styles program identified most of the students as showing tactual and kinesthetic preferences in reading. Moreover, a diversity of reading materials were used to meet the students' perceptual strengths. On the other hand, filmstrips, the System 80, tape-recorded books, games, puzzles, puppets, activity cards, and field trips were used to improve comprehension and other reading skills.

Model Design and Findings

The Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS) was administered to students in Fall 1989 and in Spring 1990. A Model A design was used to determine students' level of reading progress. In this evaluation design, the posttest performance of thirty-nine (39) students was compared to their pretest performance. This sample was composed of students who had both sets of scores. The CTBS scores were evaluated by using a correlated t-test to compare 1989 test results (pretest) with the 1990 test results (posttest). These findings are shown in Table 7.

TABLE 7

Reading Performance on the CTBS
Project Harold Wilson Participants
1989-1990

Measures of Performances	$\bar{X}$	SD
Pretest (1989)	484.87	106.60
Posttest (1990)	564.18*	66.57

N = 39
* t = 6.45, p < .001

As indicated, the average CTBS reading score on pretest and posttest assessment was 484.87 and 564.18 respectively. The 79.31 point gain in posttest scores was statistically significant.

We found that the median pretest grade equivalent (GE) score was 1.9. In contrast, the students' median GE score at posttest was 2.3. This indicated that the students gained four months in reading. However, the normal rate of growth is eight months.

Discussion of Findings

This year's data is consistent with previous findings which implied that participating students' gain in reading was a function of Project Harold Wilson. These are limitations however associated with the findings.

For one, controlled experimental conditions would have been desirable. It would have been useful to know how participating students' reading scores compared to those of students who had had no involvement with the project. The second limitation is that the variance in student gains may be due to sources other than this project's intervention. As mentioned earlier, four students received Chapter 1, and two students received speech services. The sparse distribution of students disallowed for analysis of the effect of multiple treatment conditions. Moreover, we had no details on precisely what those Chapter 1 and other speech services entailed. A third limitation is that no information was provided on the age of each tested student. We remind the reader that students' ages ranged from 7 to 14 years. It is possible that the younger students' scores depressed the group means. The lack of age information translates into our inability to disaggregate the data. For future evaluations, we are requesting that the project instructors include:

(a) the age of each participating student, and

(b) information on the class from which the student was drawn.

Finally, it is of interest to point out that diagnostic assessment of students' reading style might account for the observed findings of students gaining four months in reading. Perhaps, these scores could be maximized.

Earlier on in our report on this project, it was reported that the majority of students showed tactual and kinesthetic preferences. Yet, there was no information in either this project's grant proposal or its final report on the diagnostic reading tests used to identify students' reading strengths and weaknesses. It is therefore difficult to ascertain if the students obtained the appropriate reading interventions.

Indeed, there is convincing evidence that reading is a complex behavior composed of many skills (see Marozas & May, 1988). The literature also shows that several different categories of behaviors are sampled by diagnostic reading tests. Other tests or subtests may focus on specific reading skills, word-attack skills, listening comprehension, and rate of reading. Hence, one prominent contention is that any diagnostic assessment test will give an incomplete picture of reading or reading related behaviors (Marozas & May, 1988). It must be remarked that we do not know if Project Harold Wilson used diagnostic assessment tools which measured the broad and complex domain of reading behaviors. We therefore do not know if each student's reading strengths and weaknesses were adequately measured. Certainly, this information is central in making instructional planning decisions for an intensive and individualized reading program.

Objective 3

Similar to previous years, a major objective of Project Harold Wilson was to prepare academically those students who would return to a regular elementary school.

Evaluation Finding

No evidence has been forthcoming from this project as to which students have actually been returned to a regular elementary school. We recommend that the data be included in the project's future reports.

On-Site Visit

We visited the Project Harold Wilson classroom on June 7, 1990. During that visit, we toured the reading room and observed a reading session and interviewed the project instructor.

The reading room was among the more impressive academic environments we have seen in this evaluation. Specifically, we were impressed with the layout and content of academic resources which were available to enhance participants' reading skills. We were also pleased with the teacher's use of innovative instructional techniques.

While it is oftentimes difficult to achieve, we deeply believe that especially in an individualized academic context, care must be taken that students with dominant personalities do not overwhelm the classroom environment. For instance, when questions are posed to a particular student, the dominant person should not be allowed to unilaterally shout out a response. Such behaviors might in turn serve to inhibit the academic performance of the more reserved and shy students.

Finally, the project teacher indicated that students could probably benefit from more reading sessions. She expressed the willingness to teach the students each day of the week. She stated her desire for an instructional aide to be assigned to this project.

In summary, the findings from this year, coupled with our own observations suggest that Project Harold Wilson can easily progress to a model reading program in special education for the Newark School District. This will require action on the issues raised in this report. We trust that the project teacher's viewpoints are affirmatively responded to by the appropriate persons.

Project Montgomery Reading and Mathematics Laboratories

Reading Instructor: Peggy Brown
Math Instructor: Barbara Costa

This project's grant proposal stated that students with math and reading functional levels of performance at a grade equivalent (GE) of 2.5 and below needed intensified and individualized instruction. It was predicted that this form of instruction would result in improvement in student performance. Other goals provided for:

(a) the development of competency in basic functional survival skills, and

(b) reinforcement of the basic skills acquired in the regular classroom.

A learning center was proposed to enhance independent work activities.

In evaluating both laboratories, we will first attend to the reading laboratory; we will then shift the focus to a discussion of the mathematics laboratory.

Reading Lab

Remedial reading was provided to thirty (30) classified students between the ages of 14 to 19 years. The reading lab was comprised of 12 emotionally disturbed students, 11 educable mentally retarded, 4 perceptually impaired and 2 neurologically impaired students. There was one student classified as multiple handicapped. This project attempted to provide students with fifty minutes of daily reading instruction. There were some students who got speech services (N = 7) and others who received E.S.L. services (N = 5). None of the students got Chapter I services.

In an effort to attain the lab's objectives, students were reported to have been exposed to high-interest and low-level materials, visual aids and trips. Students' reading progress was monitored using the CTBS and the Diagnostic Inventory Kit-New Readers. However, we are relying on the CTBS scores for this report.

This decision is primarily informed by the fact that we were unable to acquire adequate information on the diagnostic test. Thus, we cannot vouch for its usefulness. In conjunction, this reading lab served a variety of classified students. We are unclear if this diagnostic tool covered the broad range of reading and reading related behaviors for these students. Such precision is essential for evaluatory purposes. We are by no means suggesting that the CTBS is of greater utility. As we will show later on, there are serious questions on the use of the CTBS or any norm referenced academic test in classified student populations.

Model Design and Findings

A model A design was used to measure students' degree of reading progress. In this evaluation procedure, the posttest scores of thirteen (13) students were compared to their pretest scores. The CTBS was administered to students in Spring 1989 and in Spring 1990. These scores were provided to us by the administrators of Montgomery Pre-Vocational High School. We were informed that a robbery had occurred at the school and a number of test protocols were stolen. This provides one possible explanation for the relatively small number of students which comprised the sample.

TABLE 8

Reading Performance on the CTBS
Project Montgomery Participants
1989-1990

Measures of Performances	$\underline{\bar{X}}$	SD
Pretest (1989)	539.46	69.92
Posttest (1990)	552.69	69.72

N = 13
t = 2.10, p = .05

The research findings indicated that student participants gained 13 points on their reading scores. This gain was statistically significant. Yet, these gains do not seem to have affected the group's overall reading performance. To illustrate, approximately 54% of the students were reading at or below GE 2.4 on the pretest. The exact figures held on posttesting. This indicates that there was no significant shift in the proportion of students scoring at 2.5 and above.

As was mentioned earlier, the project's proposal contended that students with reading levels at or below GE 2.5 would be selected for program participation. However, the pretest scores from the project's records reflected that six students were above the GE 2.5 cut-off score. Thus, it is difficult to ascertain the degree to which the program impacted on students' academic performance as measured by the CTBS.

Objective 2.0

This objective provided for the development of the students' competency in functional survival skills.

Evaluation Findings

First, it is unclear what "functional survival skills" are being discussed. We have no knowledge of (a) the competency criterion and (b) how competency was measured over the past academic year. Finally, there was no information provided on the activities and processes associated with meeting the stated objective.

Objective 3.0

This objective pertains to the reinforcement of basic skills acquired in the regular classroom.

Evaluation Findings

We did not have access to information which would allow for evaluation of this objective. It must be emphasized that each project must provide the evidentiary information which supports the notion that an objective has been met. As it pertains to the objective under discussion,

(a) Greater specificity is required in describing the basic skills mentioned.

(b) Data is needed on each participating student's pre and posttest scores on skills.

(c) Specific information on reinforcement processes and schedules should also be presented.

Objective 4.0

A learning center was to be developed to enhance independent work activities.

Evaluation Findings

We saw no documented evidence on this objective being accomplished. However, it is our understanding that in this school district a learning center entails the maximization of one's room arrangements and furnishing that area with pertinent educational materials. Project personnel should demonstrate how the center fosters students' academic proficiency.

Project Montgomery
Mathematics Lab

Project Evaluation Overview

The math lab was reported to have provided additional math instruction to thirty three (33) classified students. This consisted of 20 educable mentally retarded, 4 perceptually impaired, 12 emotionally disturbed and 2 neurologically impaired students. Students ranged in ages from 14-18 years.

The math lab sought to:

(a) increase the math skills of students

(b) develop competency in basic functional survival skills, and

(c) reinforce the basic skills acquired in the regular classroom.

A learning center for the enhancement of students' independent work activities was also proposed.

Students received 50 minutes of daily instruction. The final report showed that instructional materials stressed survival skills. Here, the emphasis was on the acquisition of basic mathematical concepts for daily living.

Students' progress in math was measured with a diagnostic inventory. We strongly suggest that future reports clearly elucidate details on these measures including (a) information on the inventory's technical adequacy for making instructional decisions for students, and (b) interpretable data from pretesting and subsequent testing of each student. The CTBS was also used to assess student proficiency in math. We have relied on the scores from that test for this evaluation.

Model Design and Findings

The Model A design was used to assess changes in participating students' math scores over the past academic year. Thus, the posttest scores of 14 students were compared to their pretest performance. Paired t-test analysis was used to determine the statistical effect of skill development.

TABLE 9

Mathematic Performance on the CTBS
Project Montgomery Participants
1989-1990

Measures of Performances	$\overline{X}$	SD
Pretest (1989)	592.93	56.97
Posttest (1990)	606.36	50.63

N = 14
t = 1.18

Although not statistically significant, the students gained 13 points on their math scores on the CTBS. On examining the data, we saw that when these 14 students were pretested, only 14 percent of them were below GE 2.5 in math. The same figures held on posttesting. This indicates that there was no significant shift in the proportion of students at GE 2.5 and above.

Similar to the reading lab, a number of students were selected for participation who had scored above the GE 2.5 cut-off score. As reflected in the math instructor's final report, "3 ED students, 3 PI students and 5 EMR students had math levels ranging from 3.0 to 4.1." It was mentioned that these students were identified for participation by child study personnel, classroom teachers and because of a change in school enrollment. This violates the stated criterion for student participation. It is therefore difficult to assess students' attainments in math.

There is also the question of the utility of instructional materials for this sample. The sample's pretest GE math levels ranged from 1.6 to 3.9. It should be recalled that the math curriculum was defined by low level and high interest math. An empirical question is the relevance of this curriculum for all participating students.

In summarizing the evaluation of the math lab, our previous comments on the Project Montgomery reading lab are germane to this lab. These issues dealt with (a) the development of competency in functional survival skills, (b) reinforcement of basic skills acquired in the regular classroom, and (c) the learning center. In brief, as was aforementioned, there was no evidence available to allow meaningful evaluation of these stated objectives.

On-Site Visit

We visited the reading room located at Montgomery Pre-Vocational High School on June 7, 1990. We should mention that the math and reading instructors met with us at the same time. Thus, both persons' feedback will be incorporated in this section.

The instructors stated that they were generally satisfied with the past academic year. Some areas of concern centered on the difficulties inherent in dealing with students who are at low functional levels of academic performance, inadequate funds for photocopying instructional materials, and inadequate opportunities for teachers to improve their instructional skills.

Another point of discussion related to instructors responding to the psychoemotional and social needs of students. We understood that it was not unusual for the teacher to use an instructional period to deal with these concerns. We have some insights into the dynamics which account for this phenomenon. However, there are a variety of factors which mitigate against any endorsement of this practice. Clearly, the project instructor's primary role is to respond to the student's academic life. The school system must provide the requisite resources which will allow the teacher to provide the services for which s(he) is best qualified.

The Assessment of Academic Skills

As previously mentioned, the supplemental academic projects utilized various tools to assess reading and math skills. The Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS) scores were available on participating students. Project Montgomery instructors used Diagnostic Inventories which appeared to be criterion-referenced achievement tests that parallel the curriculum being taught. It was also our understanding that the Brigance Diagnostic Inventories were administered to classified students. Based on the available evaluation evidence, it is reasonable to assume that the assessment of academic skills of participating students was replete with problems.

Pertaining to norm - referenced tests such as the CTBS, historically, these types of tests have been used to provide diagnostic data and compare individuals to their counterparts. With these tests, typically the focus is on the relative standing of individuals rather than on the absolute command of academic content. Educators have expressed two major difficulties with norm - referenced tests with classified students. These include (a) the use of technically adequate devices for purposes other than those for which they were constructed, and (b) the use of technically inadequate devices for any purpose. It appears to us then that careful study must be conducted on the use of the CTBS tests on classified students in the Newark school district.

We have previously elucidated the failings associated with instructor - generated tests and/or the use of diagnostic inventories. In this evaluation, we have found that there is insufficient or inadequate information on (a) the technical adequacy of assessment measures, and (b) the match between an individual's scores on the assessment measure and the curriculum to which s(he) had been exposed during the past academic year.

Regarding criterion-referenced testing, this is relatively new in special education, dating to the late 1960s. The special education literature highlights that individually administered criterion-reference measures are emerging to be of value in classified student populations. With the criterion-referenced test, the emphasis is on the pupil's development of particular skills in terms of absolute levels of mastery. Thus, these tests answer such questions as, "Does the child identify colors correctly?."

Currently, special educators seem to have confidence in the Brigance Diagnostic Inventories. One contention is that the test was specifically designed to meet PL 94-142 requirements (Brigance, 1983). When appropriately used with pupils ranging from infants through adolescents, these inventories are said to offer comprehensive criterion-referenced assessment of important skills, concepts, and behavior.

The Division of Special Education used the Brigance inventories over the past academic year to test 1,881 elementary students and 950 secondary students. Bilingual students were also tested. We have included a copy of the results from that testing in Appendix E.

As shown in Appendix E, data was computed in terms of global scores by content areas for grade level and overall school performance. In its reported form, the data cannot be meaningfully interpreted. It would be useful to see, the data reported in terms of the (a) student's identification number, (b) special education classification, (c) chronological age (d) functional level of performance, and (d) pretest and posttest scores for each content area tested. We strongly recommend that the Office of Special Education explore with the Office of Planning, Evaluation and Testing, and the Office of Computer Education the possibilities of using a Management Information System to keep track of student performance on the Brigance.

In conjunction, for future evaluatory purposes, in using the Brigance (or any other criterion-referenced test), project personnel should communicate the precise nature of the behaviors sampled by the test. Information should be forwarded on the systematic analysis of the pupil's strength and weaknesses. There should also be information on the extent to which the behaviors sampled represent the goals and objectives of the student curriculum (see Marozas & May, 1988).

In view of the Office of Special Education's reliance on the Brigance, we firmly believe that the following observation is in order. During the past academic year, in excess of six thousand classified students, overwhelming Black and Hispanic, were enrolled in the Newark School District. We examined the Brigance inventory which was used with students in the elementary grades. We did not look at the other inventories. In our examination of the inventory, the pictorial representations were unabashedly Eurocentric. We counted fifty six pictures of human beings. Of that number, only three pictures resembled people of African descent. One of these person's ethnicity was ambiguous.

We recommend that project instructors be alerted to such Eurocentric biases in the Brigance. Instructional efforts can easily be directed so that the student population being served can see themselves in the curriculum.

In summary, we concur with Marozas & May (1988) when they argue: "criterion-referenced assessment, curriculum based assessment, observation, and diagnostic teaching are the preferred techniques for determining appropriate education interventions for individual students or when evaluating the extent to which they have profited from instruction" p. 524-525.

PROJECT IDEA

Project IDEA

Project Coordinator: Ms. Janet Calvert
Location: Bruce Street School for the Deaf,

In 1989-1990 Project IDEA, (Individualized Deaf Education Alternative) served twenty-nine (29) profoundly deaf inner-city students between 5-15 years of age. These students were under the classification of auditorily handicapped (AH), meaning "an inability to hear within normal limits due to physical impairment or dysfunction of auditory mechanisms. Evaluations by a specialist qualified in the field of audiology and a speech and language evaluation by a certified speech language correctionist are required." (N.J.A.C. 6:28)

The students serviced by Project IDEA were scheduled to meet a minimum of twice weekly in small groups. They were exposed to a survival curriculum which also covered how to deal with the world outside the protective classroom or home environment. Project IDEA was an adjunct to their regular academic experiences. The Project IDEA curriculum guide was developed by the project coordinator. This curriculum was based on cognitive and social-emotional development areas. Much of the curriculum corresponded to the Newark Career Education Program Objectives.

Objective 1.0

This objective was to teach the students to handle money, make change and purchase items.

Evaluation Findings

According to the end of the year report, students participated in a classroom bank and learned the rudiments of savings and checking accounts. Each student opened an account and was able to earn money through various activities. Each student was then responsible for depositing the money in his/her saving/checking accounts. Students spent the money they earned through specially structured activities these included learning how to order items through the mail and to purchase items in a busy mall environment.

Objective 2.0

This objective was for the students to make needs and wants clearly understood in a crowded store or restaurant situation.

Evaluation Findings

It was not clearly documented as to when and how the participating students carried out this objective.

Objective 3.0

This objective stated that the profoundly deaf child would take public transportation to accomplish all goals in objectives 1.0 and 2.0.and that the student would utilize recreational time in a positive manner. The grant proposal indicated that the students would be encouraged to take trips to the movies and to the local library. It was also proposed that the students would feel confident about visiting a friend's house.

Evaluation Findings

It was stated in the end of year report that the public transportation company was included in the implementation of many activities. It was not clear if the student travelled independently or in a group context under the supervision of project staff.

Objective 4.0

This objective was to deal with reading and explaining street signs, labels, price tags, and menus.

Evaluation Findings

The evaluators were unclear as to when the students obtained competency in these tasks. There was no data on which to make this judgement.

Objective 5.0

It was proposed that the students would be able to place a TDD call to communicate a message to the proper authority. For example, emergency calls to the police, fire station and poison control centers. Furthermore, it was proposed that they would use the TDD device to communicate personal needs or pleasure.

Evaluation Findings

With the use of the telephone device for the deaf (TDD) children practiced calling friends as well as placing emergency calls to police, fire station and poison control centers.

Objective 6.0

This objective called for the student to be able to follow both written and verbal directions in various emergency and non-emergency situations.

Evaluation Findings

It was indicated that students took part in role playing situations. It was not clearly specified what was involved in the role playing. Therefore, we do not know if the students showed proficiency in this area.

Objective 7.0

The students should be able to demonstrate basic computer literacy. Moreover, it was indicated that the students should also be capable of using the computer as a tool.

Evaluation Findings

Hands on experience with Apple computers using the LOGO language appeared to have helped students improve problem solving and computer literacy. Travel experiences were provided to develop and enhance students' literacy. The students attended demonstrations of computers and gained hands on experience. The computer literacy trips included a trip to downtown Newark, New York City, a visit to Essex County College, Newark, AT&T/Bell Labs, and West Belt and Willowbrook Malls. The activity report explained how the participating students learned to function as resource personnel for other students and staff members who needed to use a specific application on the computer. A computer club gave students additional time to enhance word processing, typing, and programming skills. Students also used the computer to create banners and flyers for school activities. The students of Project IDEA also became penpals to a group of students in another state. The students used the computer as the means of communication. The students in Project IDEA created a "computer literacy" video tape and booklet and they sent the tape and booklet to each of their penpal's schools.

Objective 8.0

These hearing impaired students should be able to explain and list job requirements as they seek employment.

Evaluation Findings

While we were not provided with specific information supporting the accomplishments of this objective, the following activities appear to have some bearing on the objective. The activity report stated that the students visited local businesses already employing the deaf. For example, students were given a tour of AT&T Bell Labs. At this event, students were able to gain insight into the responsibilities of work and gain a better understanding of the vocational capabilities, possibilities and responsibilities of the deaf.

Evaluation Component

Project IDEA built in its own evaluation factor. Evaluation for each student was to be done on an individual basis in the following areas: (a) teacher observations in the field setting and (b) teacher observations in the classroom setting. Students would also be assessed on teacher generated tests.

Program results were to be reported by:

(1) a travel experience chart that was to be maintained throughout the year,

(2) an additional cumulative written record of all specific travel experiences that a student had throughout his or her years in the program,

(3) report cards were to be sent home four times during the academic year, with individual conferences held to discuss students' progress with parents,

(4) each child was to complete a written report on all major objectives covered during the academic year.

Evaluation Findings

Project IDEA's final report stated that a travel experience chart was maintained that listed dates of travel experience, explanation of travel experience and specific objectives mastered. It was also mentioned that a separate written record was maintained on a yearly basis for each student. It was indicated that the report detailed which objectives were studied during the specific period, the students' progress and a written narrative to the parent. Individual conferences were arranged with parents to discuss their child's progress. At the end of the year, each student completed an individualized test. This test was said to have been based on the year's objectives and measured the student's progress and mastery of each objective. It was reported that mastery levels ranged from 75%-90%.

Progress/Mastery Performance Analysis

Information for 28 participating students was shared with the evaluators. It was stated in Project IDEA's Curriculum Guide that the students' performance was measured on an individual basis through sign language and/or speech according to each student's hearing and speech capabilities. The curriculum was designed by levels. Students were placed at a particular level based on their performance on the curriculum guide. The coordinator indicated that this curriculum was based on five levels of performance. Historically, most of the students performed at the Level I, Level II, or Level III. For this year's evaluation, the data is consistent with this traditional trend.

Each level contained specific objectives and it was reported that the objectives were assessed with teacher made materials. The skills that were introduced to the students on the first level were applications and forms, money skills, time skills, following directions, map skills, captioned films, and computer literacy. In the skill area of applications and forms, the students on Level I were expected to complete written forms. These contained personal information on their name, the present date, street address, city, state, zip code, telephone number, and date of birth. In many of the other skill areas, the students were shown filmstrips. For example, on the first level, in the area of money skills, the curriculum included a filmstrip titled, "Knowing Your Money": Part 1-4. In the area of captioned films, the students on Level I were shown filmstrips covering areas such as apartment house living; distinction between morning, afternoon and evening; and information on school bus safety.

The students on Level II were introduced to all of the above mentioned skills with additional skills introduced in some of the areas. Three (3) students on this level were also introduced to the skill of independent travel. Here, they were expected to be able to count out the exact change for bus fare. Students on the third level were introduced to some of the same skill areas as students on Level I & II but the objectives that were taught were on a more advanced level. In addition, Level III students were introduced to TDD skills.

Our analysis of Project IDEA's data reflects the average percentage of skills mastered. These results were based on the number of skills introduced to each student; whether or not progress was shown; and whether or not the skill was mastered.

Mastery data for the eight (8) students who were tested on the First Level (See Table 10) are as follows:

A. Applications and Forms

An average of ten (10) skills were introduced and the students mastered an average of 60% of them.

B. Money Skills

An average of three (3) skills were introduced with an average mastery level of 50%.

C. Time Skills

The average number of skills introduced was five (5) and the students mastered approximately 54% of them.

D. Following Directions

One skill per student was introduced to four (4) of the eight (8) students. One student mastered this skill, while the other students showed progress.

E. Map Skills

Only 1 skill per student was introduced to Five (5) of the eight (8) students. Four (4) of the students mastered this skill and the others showed progress in this area.

F. Captioned Films

Two (2) students on the first level were introduced one (1) skill each and both students mastered this skill.

G. Computer Literacy

Three (3) of the eight (8) students were introduced to skills in this area. One of the students was introduced to six (6) skills and mastered 50% of them. Another student was introduced to four (4) skills and showed partial mastery. The third student was introduced to three (3) skills and showed progress in this skill area.

Mastery data for the eight (8) students on the Second Level (See Table

11) are as follows:

A. Applications and Forms

On average, twenty-five (25) skills were introduced. The students mastered an average of 66% of the skills. It was in this area that the greatest number of skills were introduced.

B. Money Skills

An average of three (3) skills were introduced to six (6) of the students. Progress was shown by all of the students, 12% of the skills were mastered.

C. Time Skills

Two of the students were introduced to nine (9) skills each. One student showed partial mastery; (56%) in all nine (9) areas, while the other student showed progress in the nine (9) areas. One students was introduced to eight (8) skills and mastered 75% of them. One student was introduced to six (6) skills and mastered 83% of these skills. Four (4) of the students were introduced to five (5) skills. One student mastered these five (5) skills. One of the students showed 80% mastery and another student showed 40% mastery while another mastered 20% of these skills.

D. Following Directions

Seven (7) of the eight (8) students were introduced to skills in these areas. On average, they showed 25% mastery of these skills.

E. Map Skills

Two (2) skills were introduced to two (2) of the students. One student mastered the skills and the other student showed progress in this area.

F. Computer Education

Five (5) of the eight (8) students were introduced to skills in this area. An average of four (4) skills were introduced. Students showed a mastery level of 25%.

G. Independent Travel

Only three (3) of the students on the second level were introduced to this skill area. All three (3) showed progress in the area.

Mastery data for the twelve (12) students who were tested on the Third Level (See Table 12) are as follows:

TABLE 10

PROJECT IDEA MASTERY DATA

FIRST LEVEL

STUDENT	A. APPLICATIONS & FORMS				B. MONEY SKILLS				C. TIME SKILLS				D. FOLLOWING DIRECTIONS				E. MAP SKILLS				F. CAPTIONED FILMS				G. COMPUTER LITERACY			
	I	P	M	%	I	P	M	%	I	P	M	%	I	P	M	%	I	P	M	%	I	P	M	%	I	P	M	%
001	10	10	-	0	1	-	1	100	4	2	-	0	NI	-	-	-	NI	-	-	-	NI	-	-	-	NI	-	-	-
002	10	-	10	100	4	2	2	50	5	1	4	80	1	1	-	0	1	1	-	0	NI	-	-	-	NA	-	-	-
003	10	2	6	60	5	2	3	60	5	-	5	100	1	-	1	100	1	-	1	100	NI	-	-	-	3	3	-	0
004	10	-	10	100	6	4	1	16	5	3	2	40	1	1	-	0	1	-	1	100	1	-	1	100	4	2	2	50
005 (R)	10	-	10	100	6	2	3	50	5	1	4	80	1	1	-	0	1	-	1	100	1	-	1	100	6	3	3	50
006	10	6	4	40	3	2	1	33	6	4	2	33	NI	-	-	-	NI	-	-	-	NA	-	-	-	NA	-	-	-
007	10	7	3	30	1	-	1	100	4	2	2	50	NI	-	-	-	1	-	1	100	NA	-	-	-	NA	-	-	-
008	10	10	-	0	3	0	1	33	NA	-	-	-	NA	-	-	-	NA	-	-	-	NA	-	-	-	NA	-	-	-
AVER. %	10			60	3			50	5			54	1			25	1			80	1			100	4			33

NOTE:
I = # of Skills Introduced
P = Progress Shown
M = # of Skills Mastered
NI = Not Introduced
NA = Not Applicable
(R) = Reinforced

TABLE 11

PROJECT IDEA MASTERY DATA

SECOND LEVEL

STUDENT	A. APPLICATIONS & FORMS				B. MONEY SKILLS				C. TIME SKILLS				D. FOLLOWING DIRECTIONS				E. MAP SKILLS				F. COMPUTER EDUCATION				G. INDPENDENT TRAVEL			
	I	P	M	%	I	P	M	%	I	P	M	%	I	P	M	%	I	P	M	%	I	P	M	%	I	P	M	%
009	25	13	12	48	3	3	-	0	5	-	-	100	1	-	1	100	NA	-	-	-	1	-	1	100	NA	-	-	-
010	25	8	17	68	3	2	1	33	9	4	5	55	1	-	1	100	NA	-	-	-	5	5	-	0	NA	-	-	-
011	25	6	19	76	3	3	-	0	9	9	-	0	NA	-	-	-	NA	-	-	-	NA	-	-	-	NA	-	-	-
012	25	8	17	68	5	3	2	40	8	2	6	75	1	1	-	0	NI	-	-	-	4	2	1	25	NA	-	-	-
013	25	3	14	56	NI	-	-	-	5	1	1	20	1	1	-	0	NI	-	-	-	NA	-	-	-	NA	-	-	-
014	25	1	15	60	NI	-	-	-	5	1	4	80	1	-	1	100	2	-	2	100	7	2	-	0	4	4	-	0
015	25	7	18	72	3	3	-	0	5	3	2	40	1	1	-	0	2	2	-	0	NI	-	-	-	4	4	-	0
015	25	5	20	80	2	2	-	0	6	1	5	83	1	1	-	0	NI	-	-	-	6	4	0	0	4	4	-	0
AVER. %	25			66	3			12	6			56	1			43	2			50	4			25	4			0

NOTE: I = # of Skills Introduced

P = Progress Shown

M = # of Skills Mastered

NI = Not Introduced

NA = Not Applicable

A. Applications and Forms

On average, fifteen (15) skills were introduced to the students. They mastered an average of 66% of them.

B.. Money Skills

An average of three (3) skills were introduced in this area. The students mastered approximately 73% of them.

C. Time Skills

An average of seven (7) skills were introduced to the students. They mastered an average of 65% of them.

D. TDD Skills

An average of three (3) of these skills were introduced, the students mastered 95% of them.

E. Following Directions

Only 1 skill per student was introduced to eleven (11) of the twelve (12) students. Eight (8) of the students mastered this skill. The remaining three (3) students showed progress.

F. Map Skills

The average number of skills introduced was four (4). The average mastery level of these skills was 64%.

G. Independent Travel

Seven (7) of the twelve (12) students were introduced one (1) skill per student and all seven (7) students showed progress on this skill.

H. Computer Education

This skill was introduced to eleven (11) of the students who were in Level III. The number of skills introduced varied per student. On an average, 10% of these skills were introduced with the students mastering 28% of them.

On Site Visit

On Friday June 15, 1990, the evaluators held an indepth discussion with Ms. Calvert the coordinator of Project IDEA. We were told that there was no curriculum for the deaf students in the classroom and that was why she developed her own curriculum for this project. We were also told that there

TABLE 12

PROJECT IDEA MASTERY DATA

THIRD LEVEL

STUDENT	A. APPLICATIONS & FORMS				B. MONEY SKILLS				C. TIME SKILLS				D. TDD SKILLS				E. FOLLOWING DIRECTIONS				F. MAP SKILLS				G. INDPENDENT TRAVEL				H. COMPUTER EDUCATION			
	I	P	M	%	I	P	M	%	I	P	M	%	I	P	M	%	I	P	M	%	I	P	M	%	I	P	M	%	I	P	M	%
017	15	2	13	86	4	-	4	100	8	-	5	62	3	-	3	100	1	-	1	100	5	2	3	60	1	1	-	0	11	3	8	72
018	15	13	2	13	4	-	4	100	7	2	5	72	4	-	4	100	1	-	1	100	5	2	3	60	1	1	-	0	12	4	8	66
019	15	7	8	53	3	1	2	66	8	2	6	75	NI	-	-	-	1	1	-	0	1	1	-	0	1	1	-	0	8	-	-	37
020	15	2	13	87	4	2	2	50	8	6	2	25	4	-	4	100	1	-	1	100	4	-	4	100	NI	-	-	-	12	1	7	58
021	15	-	8	53	4	-	4	100	NA	-	-	-	NA	-	-	-	1	-	1	100	5	2	3	60	1	1	-	0	11	3	8	72
022	15	-	13	86	2	-	2	100	8	-	8	100	NI	-	-	-	1	-	1	100	5	-	5	100	NI	-	-	-	NI	-	-	-
023	15	-	14	93	3	1	2	66	8	1	7	87	NI	-	-	-	1	-	1	100	5	-	5	100	1	1	-	0	8	6	2	25
024	15	7	5	33	4	1	3	75	8	-	8	100	3	1	2	66	1	1	-	0	5	3	2	40	1	1	-	0	9	1	8	88
025	15	-	15	100	2	2	-	0	8	4	4	50	2	-	2	100	1	-	1	100	NI	-	-	-	NI	-	-	-	12	3	3	25
026	15	15	-	0	2	-	2	100	8	3	5	62	NI	-	-	-	NI	-	-	-	1	-	1	100	NI	-	-	-	8	4	3	37
027	15	-	15	100	4	1	3	75	8	6	2	25	3	-	3	100	1	-	1	100	4	3	1	25	1	1	-	0	11	4	7	63
028	15	2	13	87	2	1	1	5	8	3	5	62	2	-	2	100	1	1	-	0	NI	-	-	-	NI	-	-	-	8	6	2	25
AVER. %	15			66	3			73	3			65	3			95	1			73	4			64	1			0	10			49

NOTE: I = # of Skills Introduced

P = Progress Shown

M = # of Skills Mastered

NI = Not Introduced

NA = Not Applicable

were requirements for acceptance into Project IDEA and that the testing procedure began at the age of seven (7). She claimed that for the eight (8) or nine (9) year old students to be admitted into project IDEA, they had to be able to count to 100, read colors and be on a .5 reading level.

The coordinator expressed that there ought to be higher expectations in deaf education. She felt that educators needed to focus on ways of improving the thinking skills of deaf students. Some of the skills that the project coordinator had planned to work on were telecommunication skills, writing skills and the student's utilization of video cameras. We were told that she had faced some problems with scheduling the students for this project.

The project coordinator felt that more innovative and exciting ideas should be put into place to enhance learning for deaf students. We were given a copy of the A+ Apple II IDEA magazine which featured the participating students from Project IDEA. This magazine article told of how the students used the computer, video camera and the TDD to broaden their horizons by becoming penpals to students in another state.

We were informed that Project IDEA's bilingual teacher aide was out on maternity leave for a long period of time during the 1989-1990 school year. Ms. Calvert claimed that she was promised a replacement substitute teacher aide. According to her, she never received any assistance until the bilingual teacher aide returned from her leave. The coordinator stated that this lack of assistance hindered travel experiences. The project coordinator told us that eleven (11) of the students who were in Project IDEA were scheduled to graduate in June.

PROJECT INTERVENTION

Project Intervention

Project Coordinator: Mrs. Elayne Nord
Location: Thirteenth Avenue School

It has been documented by child developmental specialists that the first six years of a child's life represent the highest growth potential period in physical, perceptual, linguistic, cognitive and affective development (Lerner, Mardell-Czudnowski, & Goldberg 1981). Beginning in the 1960's, Early Intervention Programs (EIP) were designed to provide optimum learning experiences during the child's initial years of existence. For instance, federal legislation instituted Headstart Programs to meet the total developmental needs of economically deprived children. Similarly, in the field of special education, early periods of development are purported to be crucial for the handicapped child. One argument is that the earlier the child's exposure to educational programs, the greater the chances of lessening the impact of the handicapping condition on both the child and society.

In 1968, PL 90-583 "The Handicapped Children's Early Education Assistance Act" provided money for the development of experimental projects for young handicapped children and their families. In the early 1970's, PL 92-924 and PL 93-644 required all Headstart programs to include a minimum of 10% handicapped children in their enrollment. In 1977, PL 94-142 mandated services for "all handicapped children". In 1979, PL 99-457 mandated that by 1990, all rights and protections of PL 94-142 must be extended to all 3-5 year old handicapped children. PL 99-457 also made services available to all 2 year olds and younger children on a discretionary basis (Marozas & May, 1988).

Project Intervention began in September 1981 after federal and state laws legislated the establishment of the preschool handicapped programs. The primary purpose was to utilize outreach activities so that information could be disseminated to both parents and the community on services available to educationally handicapped children between three and five years of age. Another purpose was to expand the Newark school district's existing preschool program to potentially handicapped youngsters. Hence, in its early history, Project Intervention sought to make parents and agencies aware of this program's availability.

During the 1989-1990 school year, Project Intervention, sponsored by the Office of Child Guidance and Placement of the Newark Board of Education, handled all new referrals for the Pre School Handicapped (PSH) and Transitional Kindergarten (TK) classes. TK classes are said to be for kindergarten students who are not developmentally prepared for regular kindergarten. The coordinator of this project was responsible for all intake procedures and for contacts with both parents and agency personnel. The coordinator first referred parents to the various community agencies. Then, the child was screened, evaluated and classified for special services. After the evaluation process and placement, the coordinator was responsible for the follow-up of students as they entered or exited the PSH and/or TK Program. Placement took place in nine different schools within the District (see Appendix J for PSH sites and Appendix K for TK sites). In evaluating Project Intervention, we will present the supportive evidence for the degree to which this project met its stated goals and objectives.

Objective 1.0

This objective dealt with informing and keeping community agencies aware of the preschool handicapped program and the types of services that were provided.

Evaluation Findings

A Community Service Fair was held at the Parent Center at Thirteenth

Avenue School on November 28, 1989. Representatives from various community agencies were present to make parents and others aware of day care, health, and food services, and many other services within Essex County (see Appendix L for participating agencies). A workshop titled Newark Board of Education, Pre-School Handicapped Program was held on January 23, 1990. The purpose of this workshop was to provide information to community-wide preschool coordinators, supervisors and administrators. The aim was to give them a better understanding of referral procedures and the evaluation process. Workshop participants were provided with resource lists which identified Pre School Handicapped Team Members and Staff at the Board of Education. There were approximately 80 persons in attendance at this workshop. They represented various agencies including the EIP at Beth Israel Medical Center, The Leaguers Head Start Program, The Newark Pre School Council, Division of Youth and Family Services, Rutgers Chen School, YMWCA of Newark, Tri City, Urban Pre-K, Full Gospel Learning Center, and several others.

Objective 2.0

This objective was to maintain a regular flow of new candidates into the program.

Evaluation Findings

Included with the end of the year report was documentation on new referrals which totalled approximately 485 children. The evaluators were told that although these children were referred for services, many parents and/or guardians did not follow through with the project coordinator's recommendations. The coordinator also indicated that monthly referral statistics were extremely difficult to maintain due to the frequent lapses between verbal and written referrals from a variety of sources including parents, guardians, and outside agencies. For the 1989-1990 school year, 135 children were referred to the project (see Appendix M for a breakdown of referral activities).

Objective 3.0

This objective called for the coordinator to work closely with parents of participating children.

Evaluation Findings

Documentation of the activities that were developed to keep the parents informed was reviewed. There were two Parent Coordinators, one at Thirteenth Ave School and the other at Camden St. School, who worked along with the coordinator of this project. The first parent gathering was an Orientation Meeting on October 24, 1989. On November 28, 1989, Mrs. Nord coordinated a Community Services Fair, at Thirteenth Ave. School that had booths in which representatives from various agencies were present. A Holiday Workshop took place on December 15, 1989, at Camden St. School. At this workshop, parents were offered ideas and instructions on how to make educational toys and games for their children.

On January 17, 1990, an Orientation Meeting was held for parents at Thirteenth Ave. School. This was to inform them of the various options for the children who were leaving the program. On January 18, the Orientation to Leaving the Program was held at Camden St. School. A Nutrition Program was held for the parents on March 7, 1990, at Thirteenth Ave. School. This presentation was done by Claudette Austin who was a Pediatric Nutritionist at the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey (UMDNJ). On March 27, 1990, attorney Emerson Dickman made a presentation to inform parents about the New Jersey Law on Handicapped Education. His aim was to help parents understand the law on the Child Study Team's evaluation of their children. A Drug Abuse Workshop was presented for parents at Camden St. School by a staff member from the UMDNJ on April 26, 1990.

On May 1, 1990, a Summer Camp Fair was held for the parents. This event allowed agencies to provide information on summer activities for children ages 3-16. This information included free activities that were available at the local library, museum, and other special resources (A list of participants can be found in Appendix N).

A committee was formed to facilitate the success of a Teddy Bear Fair. The committee's task was to disseminate information on the fair. It also asked for donations and contributions for this event. The fair was held on May 22, 1990 at Thirteenth Ave School. This event was to benefit PSH and TK children. Games and activities were planned for the youngsters. Attendees included parents, children and community agencies.

The last parent meeting was held on June 6, 1990. The topic was Prevention of Child Abuse. A detective from the sheriff's office made the presentation and it was indicated that current information was shared on the subject.

Objective 4.0

This objective called for regular communication among the components of the program: staff, parents, and administration.

Evaluation Findings

The project coordinator prepared and distributed a newsletter titled "Kid-Bits" which shared information among staff and parents. The coordinator was also a member of the PSH Task Force. This was formed in Spring 1989 to help in the referral process and other important decisions concerning the PSH and TK students. The Task Force included PSH Team members and representatives from various EIP Programs throughout the city of Newark.

The coordinator was responsible for the dissemination of materials relating to workshops. It was her responsibility to receive approval of these activities from the various departments at the Newark Board of Education. She also designed the flyers for the parent meetings and other activities.

Project Intervention - Speech Correctionists CST-I and CST-II

Two speech correctionists were added to the Pre School Handicapped/Child Study Team (PSH/CST) on a full-time basis. One was assigned to the PSH/ CST-I and the other was assigned to the PSH/CST-II. Their main purpose was to provide services to help meet the demands of the increased PSH population.

The goals and objectives of the speech correctionists were to assist in the assessment of the preschoolers referred for evaluation, to train teachers on methods designed to bring out spontaneous speech skills which would improve the child's language skills at home, and to provide assistance to the in-house speech correctionist who was already a part of the Child Study Team.

Evaluation Findings

Speech Correctionist PSH/CST-I

The monthly statistics showed that eighty-eight (88) children were screened: thirty-three (33) for an initial evaluation and thirty-five (35) for re-evaluation. Twenty (20) children from outside agencies were referred for TK evaluations.

Seventeen (17) children were declassified and it was reported that they would be attending regular kindergarten and first grade classes in September 1990. Two (2) children were referred to first grade with Resource Room (RR) intervention. Five (5) children did not require special education services and were referred to regular preschool programs and outpatient speech clinics.

The end of the year report stated that the PSH/CST-I speech correctionist participated in the development of eighty (80) IEPs and developed the speech and language goals and objectives for those IEPs. The final report also indicated that this speech correctionist conducted sixty-seven (67) classroom consultations. During these consultations with teachers, she and the in-house speech correctionist were said to have demonstrated and discussed techniques for language intervention and implementation of the IEP goals. Future reports should elucidate the precise processes and outcomes associated with such interventions.

In providing assistance to the parents of the preschool handicapped children, the final report stated that at the December 15, 1989 Holiday Workshop, the speech correctionist instructed parents on the construction and use of home made toys. The purpose was to develop activities to expand their child's language skills. The speech correctionist also stated that at the workshop held on January 23, 1990, for all city agencies, she gave an overview of the preschool handicapped program and the services.

Evaluation Findings

Speech Correctionist PSH/CST-II

The final report for the 1989-1990 school year stated that the PSH/CST-II speech correctionist screened ninety-two (92) children. Fifty-six (56) of these children were found to be in need of full evaluations. Twelve 12) students required speech and language development updates in order to receive services under a new classification. Twenty-six (26) of the children were declassified and it was stated that they would be attending regular classes in September 1990. Four (4) children did not require special education services and were referred to regular preschool programs. It was also noted that this speech correctionist participated in the development of eighty-five (85) IEPs and developed the speech and language goals on those IEPs. Eight (8) students were declassified and speech IEPs were developed for them so that they could receive services for the 1990-1991 school year.

To assist the teachers and the in-house speech correctionist, PSH/CST-II speech correctionist conducted forty-four (44) classroom consultations. Methods of language stimulation were said to have been discussed. It was reported that this speech correctionist met fifty-two (52) times with parents of the PSH students on an individual basis to discuss speech development in the home. It was also mentioned that the PSH/CST-II speech correctionist also participated in the all city agency workshop. The intent was to provide a better understanding of the services offered by the Newark Board of Education.

On Site Visits

On June 7, 1990, the evaluators met with Mrs. Elayne Nord who had been the coordinator of Project Intervention since July 1981. Mrs. Nord stated that in more recent years the children seen by Project Intervention have had more serious deficiencies than those of the past years. She also spoke at length about the PSH Program for children ages 3-5 and the TK classes for pupils ages 5-6. The coordinator informed us that there was one RR funded at Thirteenth Ave School which accommodated eight (8) children per class. The instructors were one (1) RR teacher and one Teacher aide.

Mrs. Nord spoke of the Speech Correctionists who played a major role in Project Intervention's PSH and TK Programs. She mentioned that speech correctionists were assigned to serve on the PSH Child Study Teams on a full-time basis.

To encourage parental involvement, a social worker worked as the parent coordinator at Thirteenth Ave School. It was reported that the principal of the school offered the use of the Community Room so that Project Intervention could work with the children enrolled in the PSH/TK/RR programs. The community room activities were to help in the development of gross motor skills, language, and socio-emotional skills of the children. Some of the parent meetings also took place in the community room.

Mrs. Nord stated that there should be a longitudinal assessment of the children who participated in Project Intervention. We believe it is essential to indicate that we were particularly impressed with this project staff members' precise and verifiable documentation of project activities. The project's outreach efforts with parents is also commendable.

AFTERSCHOOL PROGRAMS

System Success - Part A

Project Coordinator - Mrs. Rose Campbell
Location: Arts High School

System Success - Part A, located at Arts High School and System Success - Part B, located at Barringer High School, both served as nonacademic afterschool recreational programs for students classified as Orthopedically Handicapped (OH) and those students classified as Chronically Ill (CI). According to the New Jersey Administrative Code on Special Education, orthopedically handicapped means "a condition which because of malformation, malfunction, or loss of bones, muscles, or body tissue, calls for special education and/or related services. An evaluation by a physician qualified to conduct an orthopedic evaluation is required." (N.J.A.C. 6:28)

On the other hand, the chronically ill student is one who has a health condition which makes it "impractical to receive adequate instruction through a regular school program." This condition is characterized by illnesses such as tuberculosis, cardiac conditions, leukemia, asthma, diabetes, seizure disorders or other medical disabilities. State regulations require an evaluation by the school physician, or his or her review, and written acceptance of the medical report of another physician. (N.J.A.C. 6:28)

For this evaluation, we will first present our report on the System Success (SS) - Part A Program at Arts High School. Then, the findings on System Success - Part B located at Barringer High will be discussed.

Project Evaluation Overview - Arts High - Part A

Physical and health related disabilities often limit and interfere with one's socialization and growth. For 1989-1990, the System Success, Part A served 32 students by providing cultural, social and recreational afterschool activities. Project System Success was developed to afford these classified students the opportunity to participate in various activities. It was thought that this would allow them to seek and gain social growth. Indeed, one assumption is that students with the above cited handicapping conditions and illnesses have experienced gaps in learning. Thus, the application for Flow Through Funds for this project specified "the need for handicapped students attending high school to have the opportunity to socialize and become involved in a variety of physical and social activities in the community." Another contention was that parents needed to be encouraged to participate as volunteers in the recreational programs. In evaluating this project we will closely explore the stated objectives and the supportive evidence.

Objective 1.0

One intent of the project was to offer a recreational program at the YMWCA afterschool on Wednesdays for approximately forty classified students.

Evaluation Findings

The end of the year report submitted by the coordinator stated that the recreational program at the YMWCA included bowling; organized games; use of the regular and universal gym; game room activities such as ping pong and pool. It also stated that thirty-two students participated in the afterschool program. There was a student roster included with the end of the year report which verified student participation.

Objective 2.0

Transportation was to be provided for the students from school to the YMWCA and students were to be transported back home at the close of the activity.

Evaluation Findings

The end of the year report stated that this objective was met.

Objective 3.0

This objective dealt with the provision of transportation to activity sites.

Evaluation Findings

The end of the year report stated that transportation was provided to activities such as bowling, the movies, and the Newark Public Library. It was also stated that the students were transported to their homes at the close of each activity.

Objective 4.0

This dealt with the evaluation of the project's effectiveness. According to the grant proposal, the program's effectiveness would be assessed by (a) attendance, (b) observation of improvement of skills in selected activities, (c) observation of improvement of social skills, (d) student questionnaires including suggestions for improvement and alternative activities, and (e) parent questionnaires. It also indicated that regular reports would be prepared and forwarded to appropriate supervisory staff at the Board of Education and YMWCA.

Evaluation Findings

There was no documentation given to the evaluators in reference to the observation of improvement of skills in selected activities. In the area of improvements in social skills, there was no evidence which showed that improvements occurred.

A System Success Rating Form was developed by the coordinator and the Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Testing (see Appendix F). The form was to be distributed to the participating students with the hope of receiving feedback on how they rated the activities. The form also asked for suggestions on ways to improve the Program next year. These evaluators had hoped to include this information in this report. However, despite various requests for that data, our requests were not honored. We also have no information on the parent questionnaire. We recommend that in the future feedback from both parents and participants be presented.

Activities and Accomplishments

This academic year, the recreational activities, for the most part, took place at the Newark YMWCA. These included organized games, use of both the regular gym and the universal gym; game room activities, such as pool, ping pong and modified dancing. Other activities were bowling and going to the movies. A major goal was to encourage reading for pleasure. Thus, all of the students obtained a library card from the Newark Public Library.

Concerning cultural experiences, the students took a trip to Washington, D.C. The students toured the Capital City, visited the Howard University Campus, Congressman Donald Payne's office and two major exhibits at the Smithsonian Institute. The highlight, as mentioned on the End of the Year Report, was participation in a Leadership 2000 Program. The students also received information from the Goddard Space Center about Science and Math. During the return trip, the group attended the President's Committee Conference for People with Disabilities, where one of the student received an award. The students were featured in the March 1990 issue of "Bridges Newsletter". The bus transportation was donated and paid for by the Newark Office of the Police Athletic League(PAL).

It should also be noted that this Program received $1,000 for book scholarships to graduating seniors from the One Hundred Black Men of New Jersey Organization. In addition, this organization has provided guest speakers, role models, and special plaques to honor the graduates. Other supporters of this program included The Explorers of America Program, Planned

Parenthood of Essex County, and Marthas' Chapter of the Eastern Star.

On Site Visit

The evaluators decided that it would be helpful to this evaluation for the students to give feedback concerning their satisfaction with the afterschool program. Hence, on May 30, 1990, we met with participating students and the coordinator of System Success at Art High School.

In an open forum, a few of the students expressed how the program had enabled them to attend afterschool activities that were of value to them. They noted that their incapacitating conditions had oftentimes made them home bound. Students also reported a feeling of positive growth in the social aspect. They expressed that this program fostered positive student peer relations. Some of the students were more expressive than others. The dominance of a few students raises questions about the generalizability of these feelings to the population of System Success students.

During the discussion, a chronically ill student who was a 9th grader, stated that as an elementary school student, he had received academic services while in the hospital. We understood that the District provides for a teacher to visit hospitalized students who are in grades 1-8. Now that the student was in high school, he reported being overwhelmed and trying very hard to catch up on assignments. We trust that mechanisms are in place in the Newark School System which redress the students' concerns.

While we had the sense that the students were satisfied with the project, the presence of the coordinator and aide during the open discussion might have impacted on these student's responses. We should note that the students expressed that they would like to travel more and visit more museums. In general, students expressed positive feelings about Project System Success and how it had helped to build their self esteem.

System Success - Part B

Teacher/Coordinator - Mr. Phillip Hamilton
Location: Barringer High School

System Success - Part B, served as an afterschool recreational program for the handicapped students attending Barringer High School. The main purpose of the project was to address the need of handicapped students to have social outlets. To make this possible, various physical and social activities were to be offered by the Newark YMWCA and other community resources.

The coordinator of System Success - Part A, also coordinated the activities of System Success Part B, with an inhouse special education teacher as the teacher/counselor to the students who participated in the afterschool program.

Objective 1.0

To offer a recreational program at the YMWCA afterschool on Wednesdays for approximately forty orthopedically handicapped and chronically ill students.

Evaluation Findings

Recreational activities were provided on Thursdays afterschool at the Newark YMWCA. It was stated on the end of the year report that twenty-two students participated. Activities were swimming, bowling, organized games, use of regular gym and universal gym, game room activities, such as table tennis, and billiards, yoga, dancercise, modified dancing, and self defense.

Objective 2.0

This objective was to provide transportation to the YMWCA for participating students and back home.

Evaluation Findings

It was stated on the end of the year report that transportation was provided to the YMWCA and then each student was transported back to his/her home at the close of the day.

Objective 3.0

To provide transportation to the activity sites, (plays, movies, bowling, etc.).

Evaluation Findings

Transportation was provided to the activity site and each student was then transported back to his/her home. The activities were bowling, movies at Essex Green Mall Movie Theatre, West Orange, shopping at the Union Market, Union, NJ, and attending a play called "Sheila's Day" at Newark Symphony Hall.

Objective 4.0

This objective was to evaluate the effectiveness of System Success - Part B. According to this project's Application - Flow Through Funds - FY 1990, the effectiveness of this program was to be measured by (a) the attendance of the participants, (b) observation of improvement of skills in selected activities, (c) observation of improvement of social skills, (d) student questionnaires including suggestions for improvement and alternative activities, (e) parent questionnaires, (f) regular reports prepared and forwarded to appropriate supervisory staff at the Board of Education and YMWCA.

Evaluation Findings

The System Success Trip Summary Form was submitted by Mr. Hamilton to the Title VI-B Supervisor at the end of each activity (see Appendix G). Each activity listed the total number of participants. It was reported that twenty-two students were serviced. Yet, the evaluators' review of the Trip Summary Forms showed that approximately forty-five students in total were listed as participating in the various activities, on different occasions.

On the teacher/counselor Trip Summary Forms, no specific information was provided on how each student improved his or her skills on the various activities. It was also stated on the Trip Summary Form dated June 5, 1990, that the students had a productive day both socially and emotionally, after being treated to a "physical fitness extravaganza at the YMWCA. This is the only notation of the social improvement. There was no other documentation of the social adjustment made by any of the participants. The evaluators saw no questionnaires containing feedback from the participants of System Success - Part B. The evaluators were told that the System Success Rating Form that was developed for System Success Part A, would not apply to the students who participated in System Success - Part B. The evaluators also did not see a parent questionnaire.

Evaluation Findings

In reference to the trip summary forms that were submitted to the Board of Education, the evaluators received copies from Mr. Hamilton and Mr. Forkan. The forms stated the date; destination; departure time; return time; number of buses; number of students; comments; principals' signature; teachers' signature; and a list of participating students (see Appendix G).

On Site Visits

On Tuesday, June 12, 1990, the evaluators had an opportunity to visit with the teacher/counselor of System Success - Part B. The teacher highlighted the activities that the students had participated in during the 1990 school year. The fact that the funding source was received late caused all of the activities to begin in the month of March. He noted that there were eleven special education classes in the school, nine regular special education classes and two resource rooms. Thus, he expressed the need for more funds to be allocated to the afterschool programs for the handicapped students.

We talked about the role which the IEPs play in a student's course of study. The evaluators were informed that teachers worked with the IEPs and many of the students, although they are in high school were functioning on first and second grade reading levels. The teacher told us that much emphasis was placed on reading material that was of interest to the students.

One issue which was of major concern at Barringer High School centered on the large Hispanic population. The teacher/counselor felt that some of the activities should be centered around cultural events which would be both educational and enjoyable for these students. These would serve as an enrichment opportunity for all of the students involved. In general, he argued that more programs were needed to supplement education and aid in the socialization of the handicapped population. He believed that day programs would be helpful because students who attended Co-Ed, an afterschool work program, leave school after the 5th period.

We were told that during the summer, some of the special education students work at Mt. Carmel Guild, which is a nursing home. The teacher/counselor strongly felt that the Newark educational system and the city should collaborate, especially during the summer, and create work programs that are part academic and part social. This would allow students to view this as an employment opportunity and receive stipends for their participation.

Activities

The activities that the students of System Success - Part B participated in were at the Newark YMWCA where the boys for the most part played basketball. The girls participated in aerobics and swimming. The students also had access to the sauna. As expressed by the teacher/counselor, "the students love the Y, it gives them a chance to workout." For example, some of the students classified as emotionally disturbed (ED) were allowed to use the sport of boxing to workout frustrations. One problem with the "Y" was that the "Y" cards arrived late. Better effort could be made to secure the cards at an earlier date. Many of the students could use them at any time and have access to the facility all year round.

Several bowling trips were experienced by the students of this project. It was an opportunity for the students to compete with one another for fun.

The students went to a play at Newark Symphony Hall titled "Sheila's Day". The play depicted the Civil Rights struggle of two women during the 50's & 60's. The report stated that the students' response to the performance was overwhelming. The teacher stated that activities of this nature enriches the student's interest in the area of dramatic arts.

The students also took several trips to the movies located at Essex Green Mall, West Orange, NJ. Some of the students visited the Union Market, Union, NJ to do some comparison shopping. A graduating student expressed a desire to visit the "USS Intrepid," a ship at NY Harbor which has a museum.

We were unable to receive input from the participants due to the fact that the final testing period had ended. The teacher informed us that after this event the students just do not return to school. We recommend that both students' and parents' suggestions be included in the future for the improvement of the program.

MONTGOMERY VICTORIA PROJECT

Montgomery Victoria Project

Project Coordinator - Ms. Mary Moye
Location: Montgomery PreVocational High School

The Montgomery Victoria Project, an afterschool program, was developed in 1974 with funds provided by the Chubb Foundation. The primary assumption of this project is that handicapped students need a positive alternative to the unstructured time period that exists between school dismissal in mid-afternoon and early evening. In 1976, when the Chubb funding was no longer available, the project received matching funds from the Newark Board of Education. This allowed classified students and graduates of Montgomery PreVocational High School to take part in afterschool activities. Participating students were recommended by teachers, other school staff members and parents. Students also had the option of voluntarily signing up.

A total of 63 students participated during the 1989-1990 school year. Twenty four (24) were classified as emotionally disturbed (ED), twenty one (21) as educable mentally retarded (EMR), seven (7) as perceptually impaired (PI), six as neurologically impaired (NI); and five (5) with their classifications not noted. Students' ages ranged from 14-21 years. The students met on Tuesdays-Fridays afternoons for three hours. They also met on scheduled weekends when staff support was available. In this evaluation, we will first examine the objectives of this project. Then, we will present data on participating students' performance on a measure designed to assess adaptive functioning in the postschool context.

Objective 1.0

According to the project's grant proposal, this objective was to provide for the education of handicapped students in compliance with PL 94-142.

Evaluation Findings

This stated objective is broad and nonspecific. As we have indicated throughout this report, the provisions of PL 94-142 are complex and multifaceted. This project's final report failed to explicate how project personnel complied with these provisions.

Objective 2.0

This objective dealt with providing recreational activities for participating students.

Evaluation Findings

Thirty (30) students went ice skating at Rockfeller Center on February 21, 1990. A Carnival and Health Fair was held on May 25, 1990 at Montgomery Street School. The participating students helped to plan this event. An Olympic Day of field activities took place on May 13, 1990. On June 15, 1990 the students went on a trip to Liberty State Park for field games and a picnic. May 1989 was designated special education month in the District. The participating students played active roles in a Carnival held at Montgomery Street PreVocational School. It was reported that these students sold some of the ceramic items which they had made during the project's afterschool activities. On May 30, 1990 the Montgomery Street School student body held a Parents, Teachers, and Student Amateur Hour. Students also played basketball on scheduled afternoons. Students were recognized with trophies and certificates for their participation in several of above cited activties.

Objective 3.0

This objective called for the provision of educational remediation in basic skills.

Evaluation Findings

The evaluators observed students working on math problems during the site visit on June 16, 1990. We were told by the teacher/counselor that she tutored students in both reading and math. We also met the individual who was responsible for teaching office skills. He informed us that he taught office skills during the regular school day and helped reinforce the typing skills of the students in the afternoons. It should be noted that data ought to be furnished by project personnel on student outcomes associated with remedial academic work.

Objective 4.0

This project was to provide educational enrichment experiences for the students.

Evaluation Findings

A group of forty eight (48) students, seven (7) teachers and two (2) parents took a trip to Battery Park and the Statue of Liberty. Fifty one (51) students went on a sightseeing trip to the USS Intrepid on April 25, 1990. On May 23, 1990 a group of 51 students along with chaperones went to Washington DC.

The Social & PreVocational Information Battery Project

Students were administered the Social and PreVocational Information Battery (SPIB) on two occasions separated in time. The SPIB is purported to have been developed for use with educable mentally retarded adolescents and young adults (Halpern, Raffold, Irvin and Link, 1975). The dimensions addressed by the SPIB are reported to be important for successful postschool adaptation of mildly retarded adolescents and young adults. These dimensions include employability, economic self sufficiency, family living, personal habits and communication. Nine major domains are said to be associated with these long range goals. They include:

Long Range Goals	SPIB Tests
Employability	Job Search Skills
	Job Related Behavior
Economic Self Sufficiency	Banking
	Budgeting
	Purchasing Habits
Family Living	Home Management
	Physical Health Care
Personal Habits	Hygiene and Grooming
Communication	Functional Signs

The end of year report indicated that the relative order of importance of the areas was determined by the project personnel. It was stated that this was informed by the project's goals and objectives. The hierarchical order was as follows:

HIGH	MODERATE	LOW
Job Search Skills	Hygiene & Grooming	Budgeting
Job Related Skills	Health Care	Home Management
Purchasing Habits	Functional Signs	Banking

We are uncertain of the reasons for considering one aspect of a long range goal of high priority, while considering the other aspects to be of low priority. This appears to be the case with the economic self sufficiency goal. Notwithstanding our concerns, we analyzed the SPIB data furnished to us by the project coordinator.

The SPIB data on fifty seven (57) participating students was analyzed by correlated t-tests. These statistical analyses compared the students 1989 pretest scores to their 1990 posttest scores. The students' pre and posttest performance was assessed on the nine domains. These findings are shown in Table 13. As indicated, we found that the student sample showed significant gains in job search skills, one of the three high priority areas.

In addition, we disaggregated the data to examine the SPIB performance of

TABLE 13

T-Tests Comparisons on Social and PreVocational Battery Test for Montgomery Victoria Participating Students

Variable	N	Pre Test Means	Post Test Means	Gain
Purchasing	57	17.30	16.60	-.70
Budgeting	56	15.30	15.80	.50
Banking	56	15.11	15.50	.39
Job Related Behavior	55	13.20	14.56	1.36
Job Search Skills	55	11.82	13.76	1.94*
Home Management	57	11.50	13.10	1.60
Health Care	56	13.80	14.20	.40
Hygiene	57	12.18	12.64	.46
Functional Signs	57	11.50	11.60	.10

N = Number of Students Tested
* $p < .05$

students classified as emotionally disturbed, educable mentally retarded, perceptually impaired, and neurologically impaired. The findings are reflected in Tables 14 to 17.

Concerning the findings on the students classified as emotionally disturbed (see Table 14), this group showed the highest posttest gains in home management (posttest M = 2.68). The students also made significant gains in job related behavior (posttest M = 2.00), and job search skills (posttest M = 1.95).

With respect to students classified as educable mentally retarded (see Table 15), they made significant gains in job search skills (posttest M = 2.39). In contrast, they showed significant loses on the purchasing domain (posttest M = -2.00).

Pertaining to students classified as perceptually impaired (see Table 16), they made statistically significant gains in the domain of job related behavior (posttest M = 2.25). Finally, students classified as neurologically impaired showed significant gains on the banking (posttest M = 2.60) and job search skills (posttest M = 2.60) domains (see Table 17).

Discussion of Findings

It is evident that students showed progress on the employability dimension. While home management was categorized as being of low priority by project personnel, students showed gains in this area. As we discuss later, this project placed emphasis on this dimension. This might provide one explanation for students' progress in home management performance. It is important for project personnel to explain the contradictions inherent in identifying this as a low priority area and at the same time stressing student competencies in home management activities.

On the other hand, students showed no gains across a variety of domains.

TABLE 14

T-Tests Comparisons on Social and PreVocational Battery Test for Montgomery Victoria Participants Classified as Emotionally Disturbed

Variable	N	Pre Test Means	Post Test Means	Gain
Purchasing	22	17.91	17.64	-.27
Budgeting	22	17.10	16.95	-.14
Banking	22	16.55	16.73	.18
Job Related Behavior	22	13.05	15.05	2.00*
Job Search Skills	22	12.18	14.14	1.95*
Home Management	22	10.86	13.55	2.68**
Health Care	22	13.82	14.14	.32
Hygiene	22	11.86	12.14	.27
Functional Signs	22	11.59	12.36	.77

N = Number of Students Tested
* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

TABLE 15

T-Tests Comparisons on Social and PreVocational Battery Test for Montgomery Victoria Participants Classified as Educable Mentally Retarded

Variable	N	Pre Test Means	Post Test Means	Gain
Purchasing	19	18.05	16.05	-2.00*
Budgeting	18	15.22	15.28	.06
Banking	18	14.40	14.40	.00
Job Related Behavior	18	12.94	13.89	.94
Job Search Skills	18	11.18	13.55	2.39*
Home Management	19	12.42	13.79	1.37
Health Care	19	13.16	13.95	.79
Hygiene	19	13.00	13.95	.95
Functional Signs	19	11.79	10.84	-1.05

N = Number of Students Tested
* $p < .05$

TABLE 16

T-Tests Comparisons on Social and PreVocational Battery Test for Montgomery Victoria Participants Classified as Perceptually Impaired

Variable	N	Pre Test Means	Post Test Means	Gain
Purchasing	5	15.00	14.60	-.40
Budgeting	5	12.60	14.20	1.60
Banking	5	16.60	16.60	.0
Job Related Behavior	5	15.75	18.00	2.25*
Job Search Skills	4	14.75	16.50	1.75
Home Management	5	14.40	14.20	-.20
Health Care	5	15.80	15.60	-.20
Hygiene	5	13.60	13.00	-.60
Functional Signs	5	11.60	11.20	-.40

N = Number of Students Tested
* $p < .05$

TABLE 17

T-Tests Comparisons on Social and PreVocational Battery Test for Montgomery Victoria Participants Classified as Neurologically Impaired

Variable	N	Pre Test Means	Post Test Means	Gain
Purchasing	5	16.00	14.60	-1.40
Budgeting	5	12.60	13.80	1.20
Banking	5	13.00	15.60	2.60**
Job Related Behavior	5	13.20	14.00	.80
Job Search Skills	5	10.60	13.20	2.60**
Home Management	5	8.60	9.00	.40
Health Care	5	13.60	14.20	.60
Hygiene	5	11.00	11.80	.80
Functional Signs	5	11.20	12.20	1.00

N = Number of Students Tested

** $p < .01$

We trust that project personnel will direct efforts toward remedying these weaknesses. We remind the reader that the SPIB was developed specifically for use with students classified as educable mentally retarded. Perhaps, different assessment tools may be of greater utility for the other classified students.

Review of the data shows the marked tendency of the students to show loses from pretests to posttests. This was particularly true for the purchasing domain. These paradoxical findings do not lend themselves to easy interpretation. We recommend that project personnel carefully explore the reasons for these findings.

On Site Observations

The evaluators met with the Project Coordinator on June 6, 1990. We also visited with the Home Economics teacher and observed the students as they took part in general housekeeping responsibilities. Project Personnel assumed that students may not have had these experiences at home. Hence, the project had created a homelike environment at Montgomery PreVocational High School. This area included kitchen, livingroom, bedroom, and sewing rooms. All rooms were furnished. The students were assigned specific housekeeping tasks.

We visited the library and observed a tutorial session. The teacher stated that the students were reading on very low levels and that one should not anticipate any significant changes in their academic performance. While in the library, we spoke with approximately five students. None of these students admitted to being able to read well. Each one expressed a desire to improve his or her reading. The project coordinator later told us that the participating students were encouraged to read. Moreover, she indicated that the Ginn Series which included high interest and low level reading material as well as daily newspapers were utilized this past academic year.

In our talk with the project coordinator, she noted that much emphasis had been placed on survival skills. According to her, in many instances, the staff accompanied students on public buses to help them develop a sense of direction and to make it home safely. She also indicated that participating students took part in career development activities through the Comprehensive Industrial Employment Program (CIE), and the Comprehensive Health Employment Program (CHE).

In summary, we wish to reiterate the need for more detailed information on students' academic outcomes, particularly as it relates to remedial math and reading activities. It is also important for project personnel to ensure that the grant proposal accurately reflects project objectives.

NON - EVALUATED PROJECTS

Non - Evaluated Projects

The Office of Planning, Evaluation and Testing (OPET) had informed the Office of Pupil Personnel Services that some 1989-1990 Titles VI-B funded projects were outside the purviews of this year's evaluation. This determination was based on a variety of reasons.

Briefly, some projects were viewed as salaried staff positions. These included Project Staff-Up and Project Supervision. Other personnel appointments included the two general aides at John F. Kennedy School and the fourteen (14) instructional aides hired by the Office of Special Education Support Services. For several reasons, the Bilingual Study Team was also excluded, points to which we shall return. More pertinent to our immediate focus is that it was communicated to the Office of Pupil Personnel Services that OPET would not have the human, technical and other requisite resources to undertake substantive evaluations of these projects. OPET did receive the 1990 Performance and Equipment Reports for all Title VI-B funded projects. The reports on the excluded projects can be found in Appendix O.

Concerning Project Staff-Up, as shown, the staff member performed oversight, quality control and budget monitoring functions. One argument is that the office of Pupil Personnel Services should determine the criteria of job effectiveness.

Regarding Project Supervision, two supervisors received Title VI-B funds during the past academic year. Review of this project's final report revealed a paucity of information or no data on which to evaluate these two persons' work performance. Moreover, OPET was informed that Mr. R. O'Bannon, Director of the Office of Special Education, and his Assistant, Mr. Charles Manzella were the primary persons responsible for evaluating the supervisors.

As it relates to the general and instructional aides, these persons were hired to provide assistance to special education teachers. Thus, one evaluatory approach would be to explore aide competencies. To arrive at certain personnel decisions, the evaluator(s) might need to explore the aide's training and his/her skills and abilities. It would also be important to consider the teacher's and/or supervisor's feedback on job performance.

Pertaining to the Bilingual Child Study, while this project falls outside the scope of this year's evaluation, it is crucial to emphasize its complex and multifaceted nature. As was indicated earlier, careful study is needed of the processes used by the Child Study Team for classification, eligibility, and placement decisions. Any evaluation should demonstrate that dedicated efforts failed to disconfirm the classification, eligibility and placement decisions. Here, we are concerned with the District's ability to have full confidence in the accuracy of these decisions. This demands thorough and extensive examinations by persons who understand much about Bilingual special education issues. Experts on the legal and ethical considerations in assessment should definitely be considered.

CONCLUSION

Conclusion

Public Law 94-142, The Education for All Handicapped Children Act (EHA) is less than fifteen years old. When Congress mandated EHA in 1977, special education was already an important aspect of the New Jersey school system. This compulsory special education law, however, was accompanied by a panoply of provisions. We hope that the reader will be mindful of Newark's and other public school districts' inherent difficulties in complying with EHA's specific requirements.

As it pertains to this year's evaluation, we believe that, however imperfect, the supplemental special education staff members have exhibited considerable efforts in attempts to meet the needs of the classified students. In this concluding section, we will devote much of the discussion to several issues not previously addressed in this report. We insist that the discussion is crucial if we are to present a comprehensive assessment of the supplemental special education projects in the Newark school district. Most significant, our main intent is to advocate for future improvements of these projects. We will also highlight some important recommendations that were embedded in this year's report.

We were particularly distressed by the quality of some of the projects' 1990 proposal for funds. As noted earlier, conceptual and methodological limitations were evident at the grant proposal level. We believe that it is incumbent on the project coordinators, the Office of Pupil Personnel, the New Jersey state Department of Education, and all other appropriate persons to ensure that grant proposals meet acceptable academic and research standards.

As we indicated earlier, this evaluation was based on project objectives defined in the grant proposal for funds. The proposal language implicated empiricism. For instance Project COPE proposed that "students receiving intervention will evidence improved coping mechanisms". The second hypothesis stated that "students receiving intervention will demonstrate improved classroom behaviors". It is certainly not acceptable to rely on impressionistic judgements that these objectives have been met. One can reasonably contend that these predictions ought to be empirically demonstrated. We are not naively placing the onus solely on project personnel to demonstrate that objectives have been met. Resources must be made available to grantees to help them in developing or acquiring observable measures of program outcomes.

There are a number of instructional issues which also demand attention. It was shown in this report that instructors in the supplemental special academic programs were responsible for heterogeneous groups of classified students. Yet, one premise is that the educational needs of an emotionally disturbed child may be dissimilar to those of a child labelled neurologically impaired. To complicate matters even further, the District does not appear to possess an empirical base on teachers' competencies in instructional categories or student categories. This is an issue in need of clarification.

In addition, we posit that higher academic expectations for classified students ought to be embedded in the psyche of staff members. Undoubtedly, this is a critical variable in student achievement. Individuals should also guard against ascribing the failures of classified students primarily to low ability. This tendency is one of the unfortunate consequences of labelling and categorizing students (Yeats and Weisz, 1985). Perhaps, emphasis could be placed on instructional practices and student effort when discussing the academic performance of participating students. We believe that it is also essential that classified students gain greater exposure to the mainstream academic curriculum.

On the other hand, it is important that those involved in special education remain informed of developments in the field, not only for their own welfare but also to facilitate the academic success of classified students. We have enclosed in Appendix P the most recent descriptions of the products and services of the Council for Exceptional Children. This Council is among those professional organizations which are said to be dedicated to advancing the quality of special education.

Another concern is the fact that male staff members of African descent were noticeably absent from the various projects. Several persons have articulated the need for male students in particular to be exposed to these role models.

In a slightly different stream of thought, there needs to be a cooperative sharing of the educational responsibility for classified students by both special educators and regular educators (Ammer, 1984). This is quite pertinent in those instances where classified students are enrolled in regular schools. Unfortunately, we were unable to explore the level of communication between project staff members, special education teachers and regular teachers. Future evaluations should examine these dynamics. Similarly, the degree of interaction between classified students and nonclassified students should be explored. This is of particular importance for students attending self-contained schools in the District. Previous research findings have demonstrated that both groups of students can derive academic and personal benefits from interacting with each other (Slavin, 1984).

With respect to student outcomes, we have indicated throughout this report the intrinsic difficulties associated with assessment of the benefits derived by students from the supplemental projects. As indicated, information from teachers, parents, and project staff on student satisfaction with the projects was available for review. In conjunction, these persons' perceptions of pupil progress were reported. These findings were not derived from independent observers and therefore remain soft. As we have emphasized in this report, there must be empirical tests of proposed findings. Moreover, adherence to the rigors of standard research practices is strongly recommended. In addition, we suggest that project personnel utilize the resources of the Office of Planning, Evaluation and Testing, and other appropriate resources in their empirical pursuits.

Another fundamental issue concerns the longstanding debate on the topic of special education practices and students of African and Hispanic origin. Needless to say, plaintiffs have successfully postulated that the constitutional rights of these children have been violated, and that the processes used to decide special education placements are racially segregatory and discriminatory (Diana v. Slate Board of Education, 1970; Dyrcia S v. Board of Education, 1979; Jose P v. Board of Education, 1977; Larry P v. Riles, 1986. See Prasse and Reschly, (1986); Reschly, (1978; 1982); Fafard, Hanlon and Bryson, 1986).

We are by no means suggesting that the Newark school district's assessment procedures are deliberately biased and discriminatory. However, we have gleaned throughout this evaluatory process that the District, similar to other public school systems, continues to rely on tests whose psychometric properties may not be suitable for use with Black and Hispanic students. To complicate the issue, to date, special education has not derived an adequate technology for differentiating between the classification categories assigned to students.

We anticipate the argument that different assessment procedures are available in the District for classification decisions. Yet, educational and psychological tests seem to play a prominent role in the identification and placement process. As cited above, this area is replete with problems. Juxtaposed to these, problems in language bias have yet to be thoroughly investigated (Reynolds 1982). These issues take on special significance in the context of students with mild disabilities. In brief, we strongly believe that it ought to be demonstrated that students have not been falsely identified for special education services. We have seen no documented evidence of these considerations being objectively attended to by the Newark school district.

Pertaining to parents, PL 94-142 is the only education law to mandate parent participation in school decision making and to afford grievance procedures (see Singer and Butler, 1987). Most of the evaluated projects were said to have encouraged parental participation. From the limited parental data reflected in this report, it is obvious that parents of participating students expressed favorable sentiments about the projects' activities. For example, parents thought that Project Occupational Training and Placement was of benefit to their offspring. The parents of Project COPE's students expressed similar opinions. However, consistent with national trends, the majority of these parents, whom we gathered were from the lower economic strata, were uninvolved with the supplemental special education projects.

Several school districts have deemed it necessary to work closely with parents. The aim is to assist parents so that they can find and nurture the talents of their offspring. A second purpose is to have parents assume their pivotal role in the academic, social and psychoemotional development of their children. We acknowledge Newark's committed actions in this area, but certainly much remains to be done to galvanize parent participation in the supplemental projects.

In a different line of contention, clinical and scientific findings show that persons with handicapping conditions also exhibit a variety of maladaptive behaviors (Richardson, 1978). However, similar to other public school systems, only students classified as emotionally disturbed can receive psychological counselling in the Newark school district. We agree with those who argue for the extension of expert psychological services to other classified students in Newark.

In this report specific recommendations were issued for each project. We believe that it is worth emphasizing some of these recommendations:

- Measures of project outcomes must be included in the final report. For example, in its grant proposal, Project Personnel and Parent Training predicted various teacher outcomes. These criterion variables must be tested during the fiscal year.
- Assessment of the level of student satisfaction with project activities should be an integral component of projects.
- Concerning the projects which were funded to enhance students' academic proficiency, all academic tests ought to be clearly described. Detailed information should be available on each student. For instance, information on the student's classification, age, pretest and posttest academic scores should be available for evaluation.
- Evidentiary information of student outcomes including the students' return to the regular classroom setting should be presented.
- Project personnel should adhere to standards on students' eligibility for project admittance. For instance, classified students scoring at or below GE 2.5 in reading and/or math are potential candidates for the supplemental academic programs. We found students scoring above the cut-off score in these programs. Justification for this practice is

required.

- The results of this evaluation suggest that innovative instructional practices must be explored by project personnel.
- Inservice training, colloquiums and other professional services should be offered to project personnel.
- Greater communication and sharing of information among and between project staff members must be a priority.
- Formal arrangements should be instituted for dialogue between project staff and central office staff.

In closing, it is important to emphasize that project personnels with whom these evaluators met with offered specific recommendations for improving several projects. At the same time it is necessary to indicate that several of these persons were pessimistic about any real changes occurring. Certainly, higher expenditures will be needed to respond to the observations and findings of this year's report. We are convinced that human creative imagination, will and intent can be exercised to facilitate the growth and development of the evaluated projects. This is essential for maximizing the life opportunities of the individual student.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Ammer, J.J. (1984). The mechanics of mainstreaming: Considering the regular educators' perspective. Remedial and Special Education, 5, 15-20.

Behrmann, M.M. (Ed.) (1984). Handbook of microcomputers in special education. San Diego, CA: College-Hill Press.

Bennett, R.E. (1982). Applications of microcomputer technology to special education. Exceptional Children, 49, 106-113.

Brigance, A. (1983). Brigance Diagnostic Comprehensive Inventory of Basic Skills. Mass. Curriculum Associates, Inc.

Burke, R.L. (1982). CAI sourcebook. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Dommie, M. and R Brown, L. (1977). Teaching severely handicapped students reading skills requiring printed answers to who, what, and where questions. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded 12, 324-331.

Fafard, M.B., Hanlon, R.E., & Bryson, E.A. (1986). Jose P. v. Ambach. Progress toward compliance. Exceptional Children, 52, 313-322.

Halpern, A., Raffeld, P., Irwin, L.K. & Link, R. (1975) Social and Prevocational Information Battery. CA: CTB/McGraw-Hill.

Hardmann, M.L., Drew, C.J., and Egan, M.W. (1987). Human Exceptionality, Boston, Allyn & Bacon, Inc.

Hofmeister, A.M. and Thorkildsen, R.J. (1981). Videodisc technology and the preparation of special education teachers. Teacher Education and Special Education 4, 34-39.

Johnson, D.R., Bruininks, R.H, and Thurlow, M.L. (1987). Meeting the challenge of transition service planning through improved interagency cooperation. Exceptional children, 53, 522-530.

Lerner, J., Mardell-Czudnowski, C., and Goldberg, D. (1981). Special Education for the Childhood Years. Englewood CLiffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Marozas, D.S. and May, D.C. (1988). Issues and Practices in Special Education. NJ. Longman Inc.

McClennen, S. and Harrington, L. (1982). A developmentally-based functional mathematics program for retarded and artistic persons. Journal of Special Education Technology, 5, 23-30.

Prasse, D.P. and Reschly, D.J. (1986). Larry P: A case of segregation, testing, or program efficacy? Exceptional Children, 52, 333-346.

Reid, D. and Hurlbut, B. (1977). Teaching nonvocal communication skills to multihandicapped adults. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 10, 591-603.

Reisman, F. (1982). Strategies for mathematics disorders. In C. Reynolds and T. Gutkin (Eds.), Handbook of School Psychology. New York: Wiley.

Reschly, D.J. (1978). Nonbiased assessment and school psychology. (Bulletin No. 8527). Bureau for Public Services, Division for Instructional Services. Madison, WI: Wisconsic Department of Public Instruction.

Reschly, D.J. (1984). Beyond IQ test bias: The national academy panel's analysis of minority overrepresentation. Educational Research, 13, 15-19.

Reynolds, C.R. (1982). The problem of bias in psychological assessment. In C.R. Reynolds & T.B. Gutkin (Eds.), The Handbook of School Psychology. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Reynolds, M. and Balow, B. (1972). Categories and variables in special education. Exceptional Children 38, 357-366.

Richardson, S. (1978). Careers of Mentally retarded young persons: Services, jobs, and interpersonal relations. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 82, 349-358.

Rusche, F.R. and Phelps, L.A. (1987). Secondary special education and transition from school to work: A national priority. Exceptional Children 53, 487-492.

Singer, J.D. and Butler, J.A. (1987). The Education for All Handicapped Children Act: School As agents of Social Reform. Harvard Educational Review 57(2), 125-152

Slavin, R.E. (1984). Team assisted individualization: Cooperative learning and individualized instruction in the mainstream classroom. Remedial and Special Education, 5, 33-42.

U.S. Department of Education (1985). To assure the free appropriate education of all handicapped children. Seventh Annual report to Congress on implementation of the Education of the Handicapped Act. Division of Educational Services, Special Education programs.

Yeates, K. and Weisz, J. (1985). On being called "mentally retarded": Do developmental and professional perspectives limit labeling effects? American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 90, 349-352.

Ysseldyke, J.E. and Regan, R.R. (1980). Nondiscriminatory Assessment: A formative Model. Exceptional Children, 46, 465-466.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

EVALUATION FORM TITLE VI WORK PROGRAM OCCUPATIONAL PLACEMENT AND TRAINING

EVALUATION FORM TITLE VI B WORK PROGRAM
OCCUPATIONAL PLACEMENT AND TRAINING

Personal/Social Skills		Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
	Date:	Date:	Date:
	Sept. 1989	Jan. 1990	May 1990
Achieving self-awareness			
Attain a sense of body	65%	71%	76%
Identify interests and abilities	56%	67%	76%
Identify emotions	29%	50%	59%
Identify needs	62%	85%	88%
Understand the physical self	58%	67%	84%
Acquiring self-confidence			
Express feeling of worth	36%	47%	61%
Tell how others see him	26%	36%	50%
Accept praise	76%	82%	94%
Accept criticism	18%	21%	42%
Develop confidence in self	29%	48%	58%
Achieving socially responsible behavior			
Know character traits needed for acceptance	12%	41%	53%
Know proper behavior in public places	56%	65%	76%
Develop respect for the rights and property of others	56%	68%	79%
Recognize authority and follow instructions	26%	53%	71%
Recognize personal roles	44%	59%	76%
Maintaining good interpersonal skills			
Know how to listen and respond	24%	50%	67%
Know how to make and maintain friendships	41%	53%	68%
Establish appropriate heterosexual relationships	41%	65%	62%
Achieving independence			
Understand impact of behavior upon others	7%	35%	55%
Understand self-organization	20%	35%	45%
Develop goal-seeking behavior	17%	39%	65%
Drive toward self-actualization	18%	33%	43%

Personal/Social Skills		Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
	Date:	Date:	Date:
	Sept. 1989	Jan. 1990	May 1990
Achieving problem solving skills			
Differentiate bipolar concepts	7%	-	18%
Understand the need for goals	11%	32%	40%
Look at alternatives	10%	29%	45%
Anticipate consequences	14%	43%	55%
Know where to find good advice	14%	48%	80%
Communicating adequately with others			
Recognize emergency situations	43%	61%	75%
Read at level needed for future goals	18%	36%	56%
Write at level needed for future goals	27%	56%	50%
Speak adequately for understanding	56%	70%	79%
Understand the subtleties of communication	28%	52%	58%
Occupational Skills			
Knowing and exploring occupational possibilities			
Identify the personal values met through work	18%	44%	55%
Identify the societal values met through work	18%	41%	46%
Identify the remunerative aspects of work	11%	22%	39%
Understands classification of jobs into different occupational systems	20%	27%	32%
Identify occupational opportunities available locally	21%	26%	23%
Identify sources of occupational information	-	14%	57%
Selecting and planning occupational choices			
Identify major occupational needs	13%	23%	57%
Identify major occupational interests	13%	38%	63%
Identify occupational attitudes	11%	11%	50%
Identify requirements of appropriate and available jobs	12%	31%	47%
Make realistic occupational choice	10%	40%	37%

Occupational Skills		Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
	Date:	Date:	Date:
	Sept. 1989	Jan. 1990	May 1990
Achieving problem solving skills and behaviors			
Follow directions	21%	48%	67%
Work with others	35%	56%	79%
Work at a satisfactory rate	-	45%	59%
Accept supervision	62%	64%	84%
Recognize the importance of attendance and punctuality	50%	55%	67%
Meet demands for quality work	24%	42%	56%
Demonstrate occupational safety	44%	56%	78%
Exhibiting sufficient physical-manual skills			
Demonstrate satisfactory balance and coordination	61%	75%	84%
Demonstrate satisfactory manual dexterity	67%	70%	78%
Demonstrate satisfactory stamina and endurance	42%	70%	69%
Demonstrate satisfactory sensory discrimination	72%	72%	77%
Obtaining a specific occupational skills			
Seeking, securing and maintaining employment	33%	22%	50%
Search for a job	9%	27%	31%
Apply for a job	-	17%	15%
Interview for a job	-	8%	43%
Adjust to competitive standards	-	11%	20%
Maintain post-school occupational adjustment	-	22%	20%

APPENDIX B

OCCUPATIONAL PLACEMENT AND TRAINING
PARENT SURVEY 1990

Occupational Training and Placement Parent Survey 1990

1. Does your son/daughter work at John F. Kennedy School?

Yes________ No________

2. Is your son/daughter working at John F. Kennedy School this summer?

Yes________ No________

3. Is there an improvement in workskills at home?

Yes________ No________

What____

____

____

4. Does you son/daughter talk about the John F. Kennedy School work experience at home?

List any comments.

Yes________ No________

Comments____

____

5. What work experiences would you like your child to be exposed to?

____

____

____

APPENDIX C

NEW JERSEY ADMINISTRATIVE CODE
HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS

New Jersey Administrative Code 6:28
Definitions of Handicapping Conditions

1. "Auditorily handicapped" means an inability to hear within normal limits due to physical impairment or dysfunction of auditory mechanisms characterized by (c) 1 i and ii below. Evaluations by a specialist qualified in the field of audiology and a speech and language evaluation by a certified speech correctionist or speech - language specialist are required.

i. The pupil is impaired in processing linguistic information through hearing, with or without amplification; and

ii. The loss of hearing may be permanent of fluctuating and adversely affects the pupil's education.

2. "Chronically ill" means a health condition which makes it impractical to receive adequate instruction through a regular school program and characterized by (c) 2 i or ii below. Evaluation by the school physician or his or her review and written acceptance of the medical report of another physician is required. The school nurse shall assist in the accumulation of the data necessary to determine eligibility.

i. "Chronic illness" means a condition such as tuberculosis, cardiac condition, leukemia, asthma, seizure disorders or other medical disability.

ii. "Eligible for home instruction "mean a health condition determined by the school physician to be temporary and to require instruction be provided to a pupil confined to home or hospital for at least a two week period of time. The evaluation shall be conducted according to N.J.A.C. 6:28-3.4(g).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

3. "Communication handicapped" means impaired native speech or language which is outside the range of acceptable variation, adversely affects a pupil's educational performance and is not due primarily to hearing impairment as defined under "auditorily handicapped." It is characterized by (c) 3i or ii below. An evaluation by a certified speech correctionist or speech-language specialist is required.

i. "Communication handicapped" means a severe speech or language disorder which interferes with the ability to use oral language to communicate.

ii. "Eligible for speech-language services' means a mild to moderate disorder in language, articulation, voice or fluency which requires instruction by a speech correctionist or speech-language specialist. The evaluation shall be conducted according to N.J.A.C. 6:28-3.4(g).

4. Emotionally disturbed" means the exhibiting of seriously disordered behavior over an extended period of time which adversely affects educational performance and shall be characterized by (c) 4 i or ii below. An evaluation by a psychiatrist experienced in working with children is required.

i. An inability to build or maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships;

ii. Behaviors inappropriate to the circumstances, a physical symptoms of irrational fears.

5. "Mentally retarded" means cognitive, social and academic functioning which is seriously below age expectations. Such functioning is comprehensive in nature being demonstrated in home, school and community settings, and characterized by one of the following:

i. "Educable" means a level of cognitive development and adaptive behavior in home, school and community settings that are moderately below age expectations with request to all of the following:

(1) The quality and rate of learning;

(2) The use of symbols for the interpretation of information and the solution of problems;

(3) Performance on an individually administered test of intelligence that falls within a range of two to three standard deviations below the mean.

ii. "Trainable" means a level of cognitive development and adaptive behavior that is severely below age expectations with respect to all of the following:

(1) The ability to use symbols in the solution of problems of low complexity;

(2) The ability to function socially without direct and close supervision in home, school and community settings; test of intelligence that falls three standard deviations or more below the mean.

iii. "Eligible for day training" means a level of functioning profoundly below age expectations whereby on c consistent basis the pupil requires significant personal care and supervision and demonstrates s significant deficit in the ability to understand and respond to simple verbal or nonverbal communication, and to make known basic wants or needs.

6. "Multiply handicapped" means the presence or two or more educationally handicapping conditions which interact in such a manner that programs designed for the separate handicapping conditions will not meet the pupil's educational needs. All evident educational handicaps shall be documented. Eligibility for speech-language services as defined in this section shall not be one of the handicapping conditions which forms the basis for the classification of pupil as "multiply handicapped" are required.

7. "Neurologically or perceptually impaired" means impairment in the ability to process information due to physiological, organizational or integrational dysfunction which is not the result of any other educationally handicapping condition or environmental, cultural or economic disadvantage and is characterized by (c) 7 i or ii below.

i. Neurologically impaired" means a specific impairment or dysfunction of the nervous system which adversely affects the education of pupil. An evaluation by a physician trained in neurodevelopmental assessment is required.

ii. "perceptually impaired" means a specific learning disability manifested in a disorder in understanding and learning, which affects the ability to listen, think, speak, read, write, necessary for achievement in an educational program.

8. "Preschool handicapped" means those children age three through five who have an identified handicapping condition and/or a measurable development impairment who require and would benefit from special education and related services.

9. "Orthopedically handicapped" means a condition which, because of malformation, malfunction or loss of bones, muscle or body tissue, necessitates special education and/or related services. An evaluation by a physician qualified to conduct an orthopedic evaluation is required.

10. "Socially maladjusted" means a consistent inability to conform to the standards for behavior established by the school. Such behavior is seriously disruptive to the education of the pupil or other pupils and is not due to emotional disturbance as defined in (c) 4. above. If determined necessary by the child study team, an evaluation by a psychiatrist experienced in working with children is to be obtained.

11. "Visually handicapped" means an inability to see within normal limits as characterized by (c) 11 i or ii below. An evaluation by a specialist qualified to determine visual disability is required. Visually handicapped pupils eligible for special education and/or related services shall be reported to the Commission for the Blind and Visually-Impaired.

i. "Blind" means a loss of acuity or field restriction so great that a pupil cannot rely on sight to learn.

ii. Partially sighted" means a field restriction or loss of visual acuity which adversely affects a pupil's education, but which does not warrant classification of a pupil as "blind." A partially sighted pupil is able to use sight to learn.

APPENDIX D

PROJECT MONTGOMERY DIAGNOSTIC MATH TEST

DIAGNOSTIC INVENTORY CHARTS

CODE: X = MASTERY OF SKILL

/ = OBJECTIVE TAUGHT

A/ = EXCESSIVE ABSENCES

(CHARTS ON FOLLOWING PAGES)

Teacher: Mrs. R. Costa

School: Montgomery Pre-Vocational H.S.

Year: 1980-81

Room #: 209

STUDENT NAME Part I	ID obj. inside container	ID obj. outside container	ID open or closed curve	Find the circle	Find the square	Find the rec-tangle	Find the tri-angle	ID object/both sides same	Find group obj. on bar graph	Find # coins = to a dollar	Find value doll ar & dec. not.	Find val. gr. of coins-P,N,D,Q.	ID amt. needed to buy 2 obj.	ID amt. change fr. buyin obj.	Find time to quarter hour
:00-9:50															
nkerson, Leroy				X	X	/	/		/	/	/	/	/		/
iller, Sadid			X			X	X	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	
:50-10:40															
vens, Theresa			X			X		A /	A /	A /	A /	A /	A /	A /	A
ntos, Carmen			X		X	X	X		/		/	/	/	/	
:40-11:30															
orris, Samuel													X	/	
2:00-12:50															
ardy, Katrina	X				X	X		X	/	X	/			X	
ames, Shikia						X		/		/	/	/	/	/	
ley, Damon		X		-X		X	X			X	/	/	/	/	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Teacher: Mrs. B. Costa

School: Montgomery Pre Vocational H.S.

Year: 1989-90

Room #: 109

STUDENT NAME Part II	Find # from pic. H/T/O (to 999)	Find next # (to 999)	Add single digit # (sum 10-18)	Add two digit # and sin. dig. #	Add pair of 2 digit # (Rg.)	Add 2 digit # W.P. (No rg.)	Sub. one digit fr. 2 digit # (no rg.)	Sub. 2 digit # (No rg.)	Sub. 2 digit # in W.P. (no rg.)	Add 2 digit # to 1 digit # (rg.)	Add 3 # in colm. (rg.)	Add 3 # in W.P.	Sub. 1 digit # fr. 2 digit (rg.)	Sub 2 digit # (rg.)	Sub. 1 digit # fr. 2 dig. in W.P.
9:00-9:50															
Dickerson, Leroy		/					X			X	/		/	/	
Miller, Sadid			X												
Persad, Ravi										X		/			
9:50-10:40															
Owens, Theresa		A /							A /	A /	A /	A /	A /	A /	A /
Hawkins, Thomas									/			X		X	
Mc Call, Sharrod													X	X	
Santos, Carmen	/	/		X	X				/			/	/	/	
10:40-11:30															
Morris, Samuel	/		X	X		/	/		/				/	/	
12:00-12:50															
Hardy, Katrina	/				X							X	X	/	
Henderson, Yakisra	/				X								X		
James, Shikia						X	X	X					/		
Pipers, Sylvia										X			X		
Bailey, Damon		/	X	/	X	/	/	X		/		/	/	/	
12:50-1:40															
Smallwood, Elijha									/	X					

Teacher: Mrs. B. Costa School: Montgomery Pre-Vocational H.S.

Year: 1989-90 Room #: 209

STUDENT NAME Part II	Sub. 2 digit # fr. 3 digit #	Sub. fr. 3 digit # (mult. rg.)	Use array to fi factors mult. eqn.	Mult. 1 digit # (no rg.)	Find 2 pair of factors -array	Mult. 3 one dig. # (no rg.)	Mult. 2 digit by 1 digit (no rg.)	Mult. 2 digit # by 1 digit # (no rg.)	Find multiple miss. fr. series	ID odd and even numbers	Use array to find div. and qu	Solve mult. & div. eqns.	Div. sin. digit # -1 step sol.	Div. by 1 digit #-1 st. sol. (r	Div. or mult. to solve W.P.
:00-9:50															
rena, Sonia	/	/	/	X		X		X		X	/				/
rown, Kevin			/	X	/	X				X	X	/	/	/	/
avino, Rosemary		X				X		X	/	X	/	/	/	/	/
:50-10:40															
athcart, Sadie						X				X				X	/
avis, Charlene		X	/	/		X		X		/			/	/	/
0:40-11:30															
urton, Otis		X	X			X		X	/	X	/		X	/	
eliciano, Moises	X					X			/	/			/	/	
oward, Scottie			X	/		X		X	/	X				/	/
night, Johnnie		/			/	X		X	/	/				/	
2:00-12:50															
enkins, Michael		X	/			X	X		/	X					
Scott, Donnell				/		/			/	/			/	/	/
2:50-1:40															
iggetts, Tyrone	/		/	X		/	X		/	/	/	/			
ebb, Leroy			/		X	/	/		/	X	/		/		
illiams, Tonya		X				/		X	/	/		/	X	/	
illis, Marcella		/		/	X		X	X							

Teacher: Mrs. B. Costa

School: Montgomery Pre-Vocational H.S.

Year: 1989-90

Room #: 109

STUDENT NAME Part I	Find val. coins & dol. bills	Find many left buying items (W.P.)	Find cost of buy items (W.P.)	ID time on clock to nearest 5 min	ID time on clock to minute	ID time dif. between 2 clocks	Change hours to minutes	Change days to hours	Find frac. of shaded part in fifths	Find frac. shad. part in eighths	Find frac. shad. part of 100ths	Find 6th digit # to name plc. pl.	ID place val. of 6 digit #	Add 2 digit # Rg. to hun. place	Add 3 digit # Rg. to hun. pl.
9:00-9:50															
Arena, Sonia	X	/	X	/		/	/	/	X	/	/	/	/		
Brown, Kevin	X	X	/	X	X	/			X						
Cavino, Rosemary	X	/	/	X	/		/	/	/	X	/	/			
Persad, Ravi	X	X	/	X	/		/	/		X					
9:50-10:40															
Cathcart, Sadie		X	X	X	/	/	X	/	X	X	/		/		
Davis, Charlene		X	/	X	/	X	/	/	/	/	/	/		X	
Hawkins, Thomas			/						/	/			/		X
Mc Call, Sharrod	X	X	/		X	/	/		X	/	/	/			
10:40-11:30															
Burton, Otis	X	/	/	X	X	/	/	/	X	X	/	/	/		
Feliciano, Moises		X	X			/			X	X			/	/	
Howard, Scottie	X	/	/	X	/	/			X						
Johnnie		X	/		X	/	/	/	X						
12:00-12:50															
Henderson, Yakisha	X	/	X		X										
Jenkins, Michael		X	X	X		/	/	/	X						
Pypers, Sylvia	X	/	/			/	/	/	/	/	/		/	X	
Scott, Donnell					/	/		X	X						
12:50-1:40															
~~Jiggetts, Tyrone~~	~~X~~	~~X~~													
Smallwood, Elijha	X			X	/	/			X			/	/		
Webb, Leroy		X	/	X	X	/	/	X	X	/		/	/		
Williams, Tonya		X	/	X	/	/		/	/	/			/		
Willis, Marcella		X	X		X	/	/	/	/		/		X		

Teacher: Mrs. B. Costa

School: Montgomery Pre-Vocational H.S.

Year: 1989-90

Room #: 209

STUDENT NAME Part II	Find group with same # obj. (to 10)	Find group with more obj.	Find group with less obj.	Find numeral to match # of ob. (10)	Find missing # in count. seq.	Match obj. to its ordinal pos. (10th)	Find eqn. for add. prob. on # line (10)	Add two sin. digit # in eqn. (to 12)	Use pic. to find add. eqn.	Solve pic. add. eqn. with zero	Add zero to # in eqn. (10 or less)	Add 2 single digit # in a prob. (12)	Use add to solve pict. w.p. (to 12)	Solve pic. sub. eqn. (min. to 10)	Solve pic. sub. eqn. using zero
9:00–9:50															
Harris, Nathaniel			A /	A/	A /	A /	A /	A/	A/	A /	A /	A/	A /	A /	A/
9:50–10:40															
Acosta, Claudia						/				/				/	
Cortes, Annette	/		/		/	/	/		/				/		/
Vargas, Manuel								X		/	/	/	/	X	/

Teacher: Mrs. R. Costa School: Montgomery Pre-Vocational H.S.

Year: 1989-90 Room #: 209

STUDENT NAME Part I 9:00-9:50	Find the longest	Find the largest	Find the smallest	Find the shortest	Find the tallest	Find obj. same size	Find container hold most	Find obj. that meas. given len.	Find val. pen. less than 10	Find # pen. = to nickel	Find # pen. = to dime	Find value of group P-N-D	ID coins needed to buy obj.	Find time to correct hour	Find time to correct ½ hour
[illegible], Nathaniel		X					X.	A /	A /	A /	A /	A /	A /	A /	A
9:50-10:40															
Acosta, Claudia								X		/	/	/	/	X	X
Cortes, Annette		X		X				/		/	/	/	/		/
Vargas, Manuel								X		/	/	/	/	X	/

APPENDIX E

BRIGANCE TEST RESULTS

OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION SUPPORT SERVICES

SPECIAL EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT MEASUREMENT PROJECT

DISTRICT PROFILE TABULATION

OF

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

FY 1990 SPRING

SPECIAL EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT
MEASUREMENT PROJECT 1990

Evaluation Summary

The enclosed summary is the result of the 1990 Brigance Assessment. The assessment was administered to provide the district with useful criterion referenced data relevant to four critical areas:

-student growth in the development of reading and math skills;

-appropriateness of student IEP's;

-effectiveness of instruction provided in the -classroom; and

-the appropriateness of the special education -placement,

The statistical data reported reflects the performance levels of the Newark Special Education population in the following areas:

Elementary

-Word Recognition
-Reading Vocabulary Comprehension
-Spelling
-Math Computational skills
-Word Problems

Secondary

-Word Recognition
-Reading Comprehension
-Spelling
-Math Computational Skills
-Math Comprehension

Bi-Lingual

-Word Recognition
-Reading Vocabulary
-Listening Vocabulary
-Whole Numbers Computations
-Fractions and Mixed Numbers Computations
-Decimal Computations
-Word Problems

The Comprehensive Inventory of Basic Skills (green) was administered to 1,881 elementary students.

The Inventory of Essential Skills (red) was administered to 950 secondary students.

The Assessment of Basic Skills, Spanish Edition (orange) was administered to bi-lingual, however, the tabulation is not complete.

The data is presented in both graph and matrix form to represent grade level achievement according to district wide performance for Elementary, Secondary and Bi-Lingual populations.

The data was tabulated and compiled according to the student's grade level performance in each specific assessment area. The data reported reflects student performance for each elementary and secondary school, and overall district wide performance.

The raw date, i.e. individual student performance and classroom tabulation is available, upon request, from the Special Education Media Center.

It is recognized that the findings of the Brigance Assessment is critical information for building administrators. The information will provide each administrator an increased opportunity to support and enhance classroom instruction.

SPECIAL EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT MEASUREMENT PROJECT
DISTRICT WEIGHTED AVERAGE OF GRADE LEVELS
FY 1990 SPRING

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS	Grade Range	Population Of Grade Range	Weighted Average Of Grade Levels
Word Recognition	R - 10	1785	3.45
2. Reading Vocabulary	1 - 8	1694	3.69
Computational Skills	1 - 8	1762	3.34
4. Word Problems	1 - 8	1180	2.39
Spelling	1 - 8	1398	2.78

SECONDARY SCHOOLS	Grade Range	Population Of Grade Range	Weighted Average Of Grade Levels
1. Word Recognition	PP - 10	836	4.49
2. Reading Comprehension	1 - 10	738	4.18
3. Spelling	1 - 9	756	3.31
4. Math Computation	1 - 7	820	2.74
5. Math Comprehension	1 - 7	681	2.11

OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
SPECIAL EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT MEASUREMENT PROJECT
DISTRICT PROFILE TABULATION
ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
FY 1990 SPRINGS

* TJ .... TEACHER JUDGEMENT

*** Note: Shows the grade levels teachers reported that were outside the range of the tested levels.**

# OF S.N.G. .... NUMBER OF SCORES NOT GIVE*

R .... READINESS ASSESSMENTS GIVEN

GRADE LEVEL
BRIGANCE INVENTORY OF ESSENTIAL SKILLS

	PP	P	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	R	# OF S.N.G.
1. Word Recognition	138	147	***** 316	247	287	176	88	55	55	27	15	21	212	96
2. Reading Vocabulary	TJ 8	TJ 7	281	250	****** 491	200	111	72	20	21	TJ -	TJ -	248	163
3. Computational Skills	TJ 1	TJ 1	254	****** 460	424	321	49	15	4	5	TJ -	TJ -	231	117
4. Word Problems	TJ 3	TJ 6	TJ 69	****** 537	261	91	31	2	4	4	TJ -	TJ -	250	623
5. Spelling	TJ 5	TJ 9	TJ 285	****** 500	261	199	95	55	13	15	TJ -	TJ -	259	184

SCHOOLS	# OF S.	PP	P	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	R.	# OF S.N.G.
				Word Recognition Grade Level											
1.ABINGTON	94	10	16	14	10	19	7	3	-	1	-	-	2	10	2
2.ANN ST.	11	-	-	2	3	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	-
3.AVON AVE.	18	-	2	2	1	3	3	1	1	-	-	-	-	5	-
4.BERGEN	41	1	1	8	8	10	4	3	1	3	2	-	-	-	-
5.BRAGAW AVE.	24	2	1	3	5	4	4	1	1	-	-	-	3	-	-
6.BROADWAY	33	4	1	8	2	2	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	14	-
7.BROADWAY M.	14	-	-	1	-	2	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	8
8.BURNET ST.	28	8	4	6	5	3	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
9.BELMONT-RUNYON	6	1	1	-	1	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10.CAMDEN E.	196	11	15	34	5	11	14	4	6	2	1	2	-	64	27
11.CAMDEN M.	75	2	-	4	13	17	13	10	3	3	2	4	-	-	4
12.CHANCELLOR AVE.	43	-	1	9	6	14	7	3	1	1	-	-	1	-	-
13.CLEVELAND	43	-	5	7	8	4	5	1	2	1	3	-	-	-	7
14.CLINTON	34	12	6	5	2	2	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	5	-
15.DAYTON	34	1	2	3	3	4	5	3	3	2	4	-	-	2	2
16.EIGHTEENTH AVE.				REIVED LATE NOT INCLUDED IN FINAL COUNT											
SUB-TOTAL	694	52	55	106	72	99	70	30	19	15	12	6	6	102	50

SCHOOLS	# OF S.	Word Recognition Grade Level PP	P	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	R.	# OF S.N. G.
17. FIFTEENTH AVE.	32	4	7	7	3	4	2	1	-	-	1	-	-	2	1
18. E. ALMA PLACE	22	6	-	2	2	4	2	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	3
19. FOURTEENTH AVE.	70	17	12	8	9	4	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	16	1
20. FRANKLIN	12	-	1	2	1	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
21. G.W. CARVER	10	-	-	4	-	3	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-
22. HAWTHORNE	8	-	-	1	2	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
23. LAFAYETTE	16	-	-	1	5	7	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-
24. LINCOLN	5	-	1	2	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
25. MADISON	18	-	-	5	5	4	2	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
26. MAPLE	26	2	-	3	5	4	3	3	1	2	-	-	-	1	2
27. MAPLE ANNEX	16	1	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	-
28. M.L. KING	28	-	2	6	6	7	4	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	-
29. MC KINLEY	39	1	5	8	5	7	2	2	1	2	-	-	-	4	2
30. MILLER	5	-	-	2	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
31. MORTON	16	-	-	2	5	2	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	4	-
SUB-TOTAL	323	31	28	60	50	57	21	13	4	6	-	-	2	39	10

SCHOOLS	# OF S.	Word Recognition Grade Level												R.	# OF S.N. G.
		PP	P	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
32.MT. VERNON	11	–	1	1	1	3	3	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	–
33.NEWTON	103	7	10	21	12	14	16	5	6	2	3	–	–	6	1
34.OLIVER	9	1	1	3	–	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	–	–
35.PESHINE	55	4	8	12	10	9	6	2	–	2	1	–	–	–	1
36.QUITMAN	7	–	2	–	2	1	1	–	–	–	1	–	–	–	–
37.L.A. SPENCER	18	2	1	4	2	–	1	1	1	2	–	–	2	–	2
38.SOUTH ST.	8	1	2	1	–	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	–
39.THIRTEENTH	190	23	14	35	34	30	26	7	2	6	1	2	–	2	8
40.VAILSBURG				RESOURCE ROOMS OMITTED FROM ASSESSMENT											
41.WILSON	16	1	2	4	3	2	4	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
SUB-TOTAL	417	39	41	81	64	63	57	15	9	12	6	2	4	12	12

SCHOOLS	# OF S.	Word Recognition Grade Level												R.	# OF S.N. G.
		PP	P	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
CENTER SCHOOLS															
42. BOYLAN	72	1	5	13	5	11	4	4	1	2	4	1	–	12	9
43. BRANCH BROOK	63	2	2	3	5	11	4	4	4	1	–	–	3	23	1
44. BRUCE ST.	42	4	3	13	6	5	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	11	–
45. HAROLD WILSON	179	5	11	37	33	29	11	14	10	5	2	2	1	13	6
46. J.F. KENNEDY															
47. REGIONAL DAY															
48. S.L. BERLINER	91	4	2	3	12	12	9	8	8	15	2	3	5	–	8
SUB-TOTAL	447	16	23	69	61	68	28	30	23	23	8	6	9	59	24
GRAND TOTAL	1881	138	147	316	247	287	176	88	56	55	27	15	21	212	96

SCHOOLS	# OF S.	TJ PP	TJ P	Reading Vocabulary Grade Level 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	TJ 9	TJ 10	R.	# OF S.N.G.
1.ABINGTON	94	–	–	20	8	24	13	4	3	–	1	–	–	17	4
2.ANN ST.	11	–	–	1	1	4	–	2	–					3	
3.AVON AVE.	18	–	1	3	2	4	1	3	–						4
4.BERGEN	41	–	–	5	5	13	9	3	2	3					1
5.BRAGAW AVE.	24	–	–	2	6	5	5	2	–	2				1	1
6.BROADWAY	33	–	–	4	4	5	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	18	
7.BROADWAY M.	14	–	–	1	2	1	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	8
8.BURNET ST.	28	–	–	7	9	5	2	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	4
9.BELMONT-RUNYON	6	1	–	–	–	3	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	–
10.CAMDEN E.	196	2	2	31	18	47	13	–	2	–	1	–	–	67	13
11.CAMDEN M.	75	–	–	2	4	24	12	–	7	1	3	–	–	–	22
12.CHANCELLOR AVE.	43	–	–	2	10	19	8	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	3
13.CLEVELAND	43	–	–	4	4	15	7	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	13
14.CLINTON	34	2	–	12	6	6	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	8	–
15.DAYTON	34	–	–	3	2	13	2	–	4	2	1	–	–	2	5
16.EIGHTEENTH AVE.				RECEIVED LATE NOT INCLUDED IN FINAL COUNT											
SUB-TOTAL	694	5	3	97	81	188	76	15	20	8	6	–	–	117	78

SCHOOLS	# OF S.	TJ PP	TJ P	Reading Vocabulary Grade Level 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	TJ 9	TJ 10	R.	# OF S.N.G.
17. FIFTEENTH AVE.	32	–	1	8	3	7	2	1	–	–	–	–	9	–	1
18. E. ALMA FLAGG	22	–	–	2	4	4	4	3	–	–	1	–	–	–	4
19. FOURTEENTH AVE.	70	–	–	10	2	9	3	2	–	–	–	–	–	42	2
20. FRANKLIN	12	–	–	4	1	7	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
21. G.W. CARVER	10	–	–	1	–	4	1	2	–	–	–	–	–	2	–
22. HAWTHORNE	8	–	–	1	1	3	1	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	1
23. LAFAYETTE	16	–	–	1	7	4	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	3
24. LINCOLN	5	–	–	–	2	–	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1
25. MADISON	18	–	–	–	6	9	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	1
26. MAPLE	26	1	–	4	8	5	5	1	–	–	–	–	–	1	1
27. MAPLE ANNEX	16	–	–	7	–	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	8	–
28. M.L. KING	28	–	–	2	4	2	7	3	5	1	2	–	–	–	2
29. MC KINLEY	39	–	1	7	6	5	3	3	3	–	1	–	–	6	4
30. MILLER	5	–	–	2	1	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
31. MORTON	16	–	–	1	2	4	3	–	2	–	–	–	–	4	–
SUB-TOTAL	323	1	2	50	47	64	35	16	11	1	4	–	9	63	20

SCHOOLS	# OF S.	TJ		Reading Vocabulary Grade Level								TJ			# OF S.N. G.
		PP	P	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	R.	
32.MT. VERNON	11	-	-	2	2	3	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
33.NEWTON	103	-	1	16	18	24	19	7	3	-	-	-	-	6	9
34.OLIVER	9	-	-	1	3	1	1	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-
35.PESHINE	55	1	-	12	7	22	7	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
36.QUITMAN	7	-	-	2	1	2	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-
37.L.A. SPENCER	18	-	-	3	1	6	2	1	2	-	2	-	-	-	1
38.SOUTH ST.	8	-	-	4	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1
39.THIRTEENTH	190	1	1	31	27	67	18	18	5	1	-	-	-	-	21
40.VAILSBURG				RESOURCE ROOMS OMITTED FROM ASSESSMENT											
41.WILSON	16	-	-	6	1	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SUB-TOTAL	417	2	2	77	60	136	48	32	12	2	3	-	-	8	35

SCHOOLS	# OF S.	TJ PP	TJ P	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	TJ 9	TJ 10	R.	# OF S.N. G.
				Reading Vocabulary Grade Level											
CENTER SCHOOLS															
42. BOYLAN	72	-	-	12	7	15	2	6	4	1	3	-	-	12	10
43. BRANCH BROOK	63	-	-	5	6	11	7	4	4	1	-	-	-	23	2
44. BRUCE ST.	42	-	-	13	3	7	3	1	-	-	-	-	-	11	4
45. HAROLD WILSON	179	-	-	20	38	50	20	18	8	2	2	-	-	14	7
46. J.F. KENNEDY				OMITTED FROM ASSESSMENT											
47. REGIONAL DAY				RECEIVED LATE NOT INCLUDED IN FINAL COUNT											
48. S.L. BERLINER	91	-	-	7	8	20	9	19	13	5	3	-	-	-	7
SUB-TOTAL	447			57	62	103	41	48	29	9	8	-	-	60	30
GRAND TOTAL	1881	8	7	281	250	491	200	111	72	20	21	-	-	248	163

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Computational Skills
Grade Levels

SCHOOLS	# OF S.	TJ										TJ			# OF S.N.G.
		PP	P	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	R.	
1. ABINGTON	94	–	–	17	28	21	12	–	1	–	1	–	–	7	7
2. ANN ST.	11	–	–	2	3	4	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
3. AVON AVE.	18	–	–	3	3	5	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	5
4. BERGEN	41	–	–	1	13	15	9	3	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
5. BRAGAW AVE.	24	–	–	1	9	5	5	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	2
6. BROADWAY	33	–	–	6	6	5	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	15	–
7. BROADWAY N.	14	–	–	–	3	–	3	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	8
8. BURNET ST.	28	–	–	10	8	7	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1
9. BELMONT-RUNYON	6	–	–	2	3	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1
10. CAMDEN E.	196	–	–	27	53	38	13	1	–	–	–	–	–	61	3
11. CAMDEN M.	75	–	–	1	8	19	29	6	3	–	–	–	–	–	9
12. CHANCELLOR AVE.	43	–	–	3	4	16	17	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	2
13. CLEVELAND	43	–	–	4	10	13	5	3	–	–	–	–	–	–	8
14. CLINTON	34	–	–	15	11	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	8	–
15. DAYTON	34	–	–	2	6	11	9	3	–	–	–	–	–	2	1
16. EIGHTEENTH AVE.															
SUB-TOTAL	694	–	–	94	168	159	109	19	4	–	1	–	–	93	47

Computational Skills
Grade Level

SCHOOLS	# OF S.	TJ PP	TJ P	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	TJ 9	TJ 10	R.	# OF S.N.G.
17. FIFTEENTH AVE.	32	-	-	9	8	9	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-
18. E. ALMA FLAGG	22	-	-	-	7	8	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
19. FOURTEENTH AVE.	70	-	-	5	11	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	43	2
20. FRANKLIN	12	-	-	2	2	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
21. G.W. CARVER	10	-	-	1	3	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1
22. HAWTHORNE	8	-	-	-	3	3	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
23. LAFAYETTE	16	-	-	1	12	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
24. LINCOLN	5	-	-	2	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
25. MADISON	18	-	-	3	7	3	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
26. MAPLE	26	-	-	8	4	8	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
27. MAPLE ANNEX	16	-	-	2	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	-
28. M.L. KING	28	-	-	-	13	4	4	2	3	-	-	-	-	2	-
29. MC KINLEY	39	-	1	6	1	7	7	-	-	2	-	-	-	5	10
30. MILLER	5	-	-	-	1	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
31. MORTON	16	-	-	2	4	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-
SUB-TOTAL	323	-	1	41	84	74	25	3	3	2	-	-	-	71	19

Computational Skills
Grade Level

SCHOOLS	# OF S.	TJ										TJ			# OF S.N.G.
		PP	P	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	R.	
32.MT. VERNON	11	–	–	1	–	5	2	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	2
33.NEWTON	103	–	–	18	21	23	23	3	–	–	–	–	–	6	9
34.OLIVER	9	–	–	1	1	1	6	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
35.PESHINE	55	1	–	12	18	15	4	2	–	–	1	–	–	–	2
36.QUITMAN	7	–	–	–	2	2	3	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
37.L.A. SPENCER	18	–	–	5	–	3	5	–	1	–	2	–	–	–	2
38.SOUTH ST.	8	–	–	2	2	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	–
39.THIRTEENTH	190	–	–	29	52	50	40	5	4	1	–	–	–	–	9
40.VAILSBURG				RESOURCE ROOMS OMITTED FROM ASSESSMENT											
41.WILSON	16	–	–	–	6	2	5	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	1
SUB-TOTAL	417	1	–	68	102	102	89	13	5	1	3	–	–	8	25

Computational Skills
Grade Level

SCHOOLS	# OF S.	TJ										TJ			
		PP	P	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	R.	# OF S.N. G.
CENTER SCHOOLS															
42. BOYLAN	72	–	–	11	15	10	12	1	–	–	–	–	–	12	11
43. BRANCH BROOK	63	–	–	8	2	10	16	2	1	–	–	–	–	23	1
44. BRUCE ST.	42	–	–	4	14	9	3	–	–	–	–	–	–	11	1
45. HAROLD WILSON	179	–	–	22	67	29	33	3	–	–	–	–	–	13	12
46. J.F. KENNEDY															
47. REGIONAL DAY															
48. S.L. BERLINER	91	–	–	6	8	31	34	8	2	–	1	–	–	–	1
SUB-TOTAL	447	–	–	51	106	89	98	14	3	–	1	–	–	59	26
GRAND TOTAL	1881	1	1	254	460	424	321	49	15	3	5	–	–	59	117

SCHOOLS	# OF S.	TJ			Word Problems Grade Level							TJ		R.	# OF S.N.G.
		PP	P	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
1. ABINGTON	94	-	-	-	43	7	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	16	25
2. ANN ST.	11	-	-	-	3	4	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
3. AVON AVE.	18	-	-	-	4	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13
4. BERGEN	41	-	-	-	6	15	7	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	12
5. BRAGAW AVE.	24	-	-	3	10	3	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3
6. BROADWAY	33	-	-	-	11	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	5
7. BROADWAY M.	14	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9
8. BURNET ST.	28	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	23
9. BELMONT-RUNYON	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
10. CAMDEN E.	196	2	2	1	46	27	5	1	-	-	-	-	-	66	46
11. CAMDEN M.	75	-	-	-	28	17	7	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	21
12. CHANCELLOR AVE.	43	-	-	-	20	12	5	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
13. CLEVELAND	43	-	-	-	15	3	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	24
14. CLINTON	34	-	-	-	7	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	16
15. DAYTON	34	-	-	-	10	9	2	3	-	-	-	-	-	2	8
16. EIGHTEENTH AVE.															
SUB-TOTAL	694	2	2	4	208	105	36	9	1	-	-	-	-	111	216

SCHOOLS	# OF S.	TJ			Word Problems Grade Level							TJ		R.	# OF S.N.G.
		PP	P	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
17. FIFTEENTH AVE.	32	–	–	2	8	3	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	4	15
18. E. ALMA FLAGG	22	–	–	–	10	8	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	3
19. FOURTEENTH AVE.	70	–	–	–	10	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	45	13
20. FRANKLIN	12	–	–	–	6	5	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1
21. G.W. CARVER	10	–	–	3	1	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	2
22. HAWTHORNE	8	–	–	–	5	1	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	1
23. LAFAYETTE	16	–	–	–	9	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	4
24. LINCOLN	5	–	–	–	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	3
25. MADISON	18	–	–	3	10	4	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1
26. MAPLE	26	–	–	14	6	3	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	1
27. MAPLE ANNEX	16	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	8	8
28. M.L. KING	28	–	–	–	10	7	1	3	–	–	–	–	–	–	7
29. MC KINLEY	39	–	1	–	3	8	1	–	–	1	1	–	–	6	18
30. MILLER	5	–	–	–	5	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
31. MORTON	16	–	–	–	5	2	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	4	4
SUB-TOTAL	323	–	1	22	89	47	5	4	–	1	1	–	–	72	81

Word Problems
Grade Level

SCHOOLS	# OF S.	TJ										TJ			# OF S.N.G.
		PP	P	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	R.	
32. MT. VERNON	11	–	–	–	1	3	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	6
33. NEWTON	103	–	1	–	30	15	8	6	–	–	–	–	–	6	37
34. OLIVER	9	–	–	–	4	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	4
35. PESHINE	55	1	–	–	32	9	4	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	9
36. QUITMAN	7	–	–	–	3	2	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
37. L. A. SPENCER	18	–	–	–	7	3	–	–	–	2	1	–	–	–	5
38. SOUTH ST.	8	–	–	–	2	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	3
39. THIRTEENTH	190	–	–	35	30	9	4	4	–	–	–	–	–	–	97
40. VAILSBURG				RESOURCE ROOMS OMITTED FROM ASSESSMENT											
41. WILSON	16	–	–	–	10	3	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	2
SUB-TOTAL	417	1	1	35	119	44	19	12	–	2	1	–	–	8	175

			TJ		Word Problems Grade Level							TJ			
SCHOOLS	# OF S.	PP	P	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	R.	# OF S.N.G.
CENTER SCHOOLS															
42.BOYLAN	72	–	2	7	14	1	4	–	–	–	1	–	–	12	31
43.BRANCH BROOK	63	–	–	–	15	9	3	–	–	–	–	–	–	23	13
44.BRUCE ST.	42	–	–	–	8	7	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	11	16
45.HAROLD WILSON	179	–	–	1	59	20	12	1	–	–	–	–	–	13	73
46.J.F. KENNEDY															
47.REGIONAL DAY															
48.S.L. BERLINER	91	–	–	–	25	28	12	5	1	1	1	–	–	–	18
SUB-TOTAL	447	–	2	8	121	65	31	6	1	1	2	–	–	59	151
GRAND TOTAL	1881	3	6	69	537	261	91	31	2	4	4	–	–	250	623

Spelling
Grade Level

SCHOOLS	# OF S.	TJ										TJ			# OF S.N.G.
		PP	P	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	R.	
1.ABINGTON	94	–	–	24	32	8	7	1	1	–	–	–	–	15	6
2.ANN ST.	11	–	–	2	2	2	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	3	–
3.AVON AVE.	18	–	–	1	5	2	2	2	1	–	–	–	–	–	5
4.BERGEN	41	–	–	4	8	7	6	5	1	1	1	–	–	–	8
5.BRAGAW AVE.	24	–	–	3	5	5	4	1	1	–	1	–	–	1	3
6.BROADWAY	33	–	–	3	9	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	18	1
7.BROADWAY M.	14	–	–	1	1	3	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	8
8.BURNET ST.	28	–	–	6	10	5	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	5
9.BELMONT-RUNYON	6	–	–	–	2	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	1
10.CAMDEN E.	196	3	2	38	37	20	17	3	3	–	–	–	–	65	8
11.CAMDEN M.	75	–	–	1	20	17	9	12	1	5	1	–	–	–	9
12.CHANCELLOR AVE.	43	–	–	4	12	11	11	3	2	–	–	–	–	–	–
13.CLEVELAND	43	–	–	6	13	6	3	4	1	1	–	–	–	–	9
14.CLINTON	34	–	–	13	6	1	1	–	1	–	–	–	–	10	2
15.DAYTON	34	–	–	4	4	5	9	5	3	–	–	–	–	2	2
16.EIGHTEENTH AVE.															
SUB-TOTAL	694	3	2	110	166	95	74	37	15	7	3	–	–	115	67

Spelling
Grade Level

SCHOOLS	# OF S.	TJ PP	TJ P	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	TJ 9	TJ 10	R.	# OF S.N. G.
17.FIFTEENTH_AVE.	32	–	–	4	7	5	3	–	–	–	–	–	–	12	1
18.E.ALMA_FLAGG	22	–	–	3	5	3	2	2	1	–	–	–	–	–	6
19.FOURTEENTH_AVE.	70	–	–	6	8	4	6	–	1	–	–	–	–	43	2
20.FRANKLIN	12	–	–	2	3	7	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
21.G.W._CARVER	10	–	–	5	2	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	–
22.HAWTHORNE	8	–	–	–	5	–	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	1
23.LAFAYETTE	16	–	–	2	11	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	–
24.LINCOLN	5	–	–	2	2	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
25.MADISON	18	–	–	3	10	1	2	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	1
26.MAPLE	26	–	–	2	6	8	4	1	3	–	–	–	–	1	1
27.MAPLE_ANNEX	16	–	–	2	6	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	8	–
28.M.L._KING	28	–	–	4	6	9	3	1	2	–	–	–	–	–	3
29.MC_KINLEY	39	–	1	7	10	3	2	–	1	–	1	–	–	6	8
30.MILLER	5	–	–	1	2	1	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
31.MORTON	16	–	–	1	5	4	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	4	–
SUB-TOTAL	323	–	1	44	88	47	26	7	8	–	1			78	23

Spelling
Grade Level

SCHOOLS	# OF S.	TJ PP	TJ P	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	TJ 9	TJ 10	R.	# OF S.N. G.
32. MT. VERNON	11	-	-	2	4	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
33. NEWTON	103	-	-	17	30	13	13	4	7	-	-	-	-	6	13
34. OLIVER	9	-	-	1	3	1	2	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-
35. PESHINE	55	1	2	9	20	6	12	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	3
36. QUITMAN	7	-	-	1	3	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
37. L.A. SPENCER	18	-	-	4	4	2	1	2	-	1	1	-	-	-	3
38. SOUTH ST.	8	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	3
39. THIRTEENTH	190	1	3	40	52	30	23	13	-	1	-	-	-	-	27
40. VAILSBURG				RESOURCE ROOMS OMITTED FROM ASSESSMENT											
41. WILSON	16	-	-	2	11	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SUB-TOTAL	417	2	5	77	129	56	56	20	7	3	3	-	-	8	51

Spelling
Grade Level

SCHOOLS	# OF S.	TJ										TJ			# OF S.N.G.
		PP	P	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	R.	
CENTER SCHOOLS															
42. BOYLAN	72	-	1	8	17	6	6	4	1	1	2	-	-	10	16
43. BRANCH BROOK	63	-	-	9	12	7	4	2	2	2	-	-	-	23	2
44. BRUCE ST.	42	-	-	5	10	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	7
45. HAROLD WILSON	179	-	-	27	55	27	20	15	5	2	-	-	-	14	14
46. J.F. KENNEDY						OMITTED FROM TESTING									
47. REGIONAL DAY						TESTING SCORES NOT AVAILABLE									
48. S.L. BERLINER	91	-	-	5	23	14	13	10	17	1	4	-	-	-	4
SUB-TOTAL	447	-	1	54	117	63	13	31	25	6	6	-	-	58	43
GRAND TOTAL	1881	5	9	285	500	261	199	95	55	16	13	-	-	259	184

OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
SPECIAL EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT MEASUREMENT PROJECT
DISTRICT PROFILE TABULATION
SECONDARY SCHOOLS
FY 1990 SPRING

* TJ .... TEACHER JUDGEMENT

* Note: Shows the grade levels teachers reported that were outside the range of the tested levels.

OF S.N.G. .... NUMBER OF SCORES NOT GIVE

G.B. .... GREEN BRIGANCE

The range of levels in the Red Brigance was not appropriate (too high) for the students functioning level.

GRADE LEVEL
BRIGANCE INVENTORY OF ESSENTIAL SKILLS (RED)

	PP	P	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	# of S.N.G.	G.B.
1. Word Recognition	17	24	56	94	109	****** 178	85	81	105	32	22	1 33	TJ 1	113	—
2. Reading Comprehension	TJ 12	TJ 12	TJ 17	55	****** 239	105	64	79	27	52	28	52	37	167	4
3. Spelling	TJ 8	TJ 9	TJ 23	108	141	****** 213	114	107	31	39	2	1	—	154	—
4. Math Computation	TJ 3	TJ 2	TJ 6	151	****** 251	195	141	43	19	20	TJ —	TJ —	TJ —	119	—
5. Math Comprehension	TJ 8	TJ 10	TJ 51	****** 294	187	86	77	24	8	5	—	—	—	198	2

SCHOOLS	# OF S.	Word Recognition Grade Level PP	P	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	TJ 11	# OF S.N.G.	G.B.
1.ARTS					RESOURCE ROOMS OMITTED FROM ASSESSMENT											
2.BARRINGER	75	-	-	4	3	8	11	8	8	6	11	2	4	1	9	-
3.BARRINGER P.	43	1	-	2	9	5	6	3	2	2	1	1	-	-	11	-
4.BROADWAY M.					ASSESSED IN THE GREEN BRIGANCE											
5.CENTRAL	94	-	-	4	8	9	15	10	9	13	1	3	4	-	18	-
6.EAST SIDE	88	3	5	4	5	12	13	14	6	13	4	1	6	-	3	-
7.SHABAZZ	67	-	1	1	2	8	23	2	9	15	1	1	2	-	1	-
8.UNIVERSITY	78	-	1	2	7	9	20	10	10	8	1	1	5	-	4	-
9.WEEQUAHIC	58	-	1	2	7	5	12	8	4	5	3	3	3	-	5	-
10.WEST SIDE	41	-	1	-	-	2	11	5	4	5	1	3	1	-	8	-
11.WEST KINNEY	139	1	5	8	20	24	29	10	19	15	4	1	-	-	3	-
CENTER SCHOOLS																
12.ARLINGTON	37	-	-	3	2	2	4	2	1	6	-	-	4	-	13	-
13.F. PATTERSON	32	-	-	4	2	6	6	3	1	4	1	-	2	-	3	-
14.MONTGOMERY	198	12	10	22	29	19	28	10	9	13	4	5	2	-	57	-
TOTAL	950	17	24	52	94	109	178	85	81	105	32	22	33	1	113	-

	# OF S.	TJ				Reading Comprehension Grade Level									# OF S.N.G.	G.B.
SCHOOLS		PP	P	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		
1.ARTS	RESOURCE ROOMS OMITTED FROM ASSESSMENT															
2.BARRINGER	75	1	-	1	5	8	10	7	8	4	9	4	6	3	9	-
3.BARRINGER P.	43	1	-	1	12	9	8	5	-	2	-	-	-	-	5	-
4.BROADWAY M.	ASSESSED IN THE GREEN BRIGANCE															
5.CENTRAL	94	-	2	1	2	19	10	5	11	4	5	2	6	2	27	-
6.EAST SIDE	88	-	2	2	3	19	12	7	12	3	7	1	9	3	7	-
7.SHABAZZ	67	-	-	-	4	25	7	4	9	1	5	1	2	1	3	4
8.UNIVERSITY	78	-	1	1	1	16	7	7	6	1	3	7	7	7	15	-
9.WEEQUAHIC	58	-	-	-	2	16	7	5	6	3	2	3	2	4	7	-
10.WEST SIDE	41	-	-	-	1	5	7	4	6	1	3	2	3	-	8	-
11.WEST KINNEY	139	-	2	2	10	30	19	12	13	3	6	3	2	1	1	-
CENTER SCHOOLS																
12.ARLINGTON	37	1	-	-	1	6	1	1	1	-	4	-	4	3	15	-
13.F. PATTERSON	32	-	-	-	2	6	3	1	3	1	5	1	5	1	3	-
14.MONTGOMERY	198	9	5	9	12	60	14	6	4	4	3	4	6	4	58	-
TOTAL		12	12	17	55	219	98	64	79	27	52	28	52	29	158	4

SCHOOLS	# OF S.	TJ			Spelling Grade Level							TJ			# OF S.N.G.	G.B.
		PP	P	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		
1.ARTS					RESOURCE ROOMS OMITTED FROM ASSESSMENT											
2.BARRINGER	75	1	1	1	9	7	19	4	9	4	7	-	-	-	13	-
3.BARRINGER P.	43	2	1	5	10	6	6	5	-	-	-	2	-	-	6	-
4.BROADWAY M.					ASSESSED IN THE GREEN BRIGANCE											
5.CENTRAL	94	-	-	1	5	21	17	9	10	4	7	-	-	-	20	-
6.EAST SIDE	88	-	4	4	6	13	20	16	6	7	5	-	1	-	6	-
7.SHABAZZ	67	-	-	1	3	12	19	14	13	2	2	-	-	-	1	-
8.UNIVERSITY	78	-	-	1	3	12	21	8	17	2	4	-	-	-	10	-
9.WEEQUAHIC	58	-	-	-	8	8	14	8	11	1	2	-	-	-	6	-
10.WEST SIDE	41	-	-	1	1	2	11	6	9	2	1	-	-	-	8	-
11.WEST KINNEY	139	-	-	1	24	28	37	15	12	2	4	-	-	-	14	-
CENTER SCHOOLS																
12.ARLINGTON	37	-	-	1	2	1	6	5	4	1	2	-	-	-	15	-
13.F. PATTERSON	32	-	-	3	3	5	7	3	4	2	2	-	-	-	3	-
14.MONTGOMERY	198	5	3	2	34	26	36	21	12	4	3	-	-	-	52	-
TOTAL		8	9	23	108	141	213	114	107	31	39	2	1	-		-

SCHOOLS	# OF S.	TJ			Math Computation Grade Level							TJ			# OF S.N. G.	G.B.
		PP	P	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		
1.ARTS					RESOURCE ROOMS OMITTED FROM ASSESSMENT											
2.BARRINGER	75	-	-	-	3	13	20	18	9	4	-	-	-	-	8	-
3.BARRINGER P.	43	-	1	2	9	12	8	2	3	-	1	-	-	-	5	-
4.BROADWAY M.						ASSESSED IN THE GREEN BRIGANCE										
5.CENTRAL	94	-	-	-	16	28	20	12	-	-	1	-	-	-	17	-
6.EAST SIDE	88	-	-	1	12	16	24	21	4	2	3	-	-	-	5	-
7.SHABAZZ	67	-	-	-	8	33	12	9	2	2	1	-	-	-	-	-
8.UNIVERSITY	78	-	-	-	14	22	14	16	1	3	1	-	-	-	7	-
9.WEEQUAHIC	58	-	-	-	-	7	17	13	9	1	6	-	-	-	5	-
10.WEST SIDE	41	-	-	-	-	8	8	6	5	2	-	-	-	-	7	-
11.WEST KINNEY	139	-	-	-	20	34	34	20	5	4	7	-	-	-	6	-
CENTER SCHOOLS																
12.ARLINGTON	37	-	-	-	3	5	9	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	-
13.F. PATTERSON	32	-	-	-	5	8	6	7	3	-	-	-	-	-	3	-
14.MONTGOMERY	198	3	1	3	56	65	23	11	2	1	-	-	-	-	33	-
TOTAL		3	2	6	151	251	195	141	43	18	20	-	-	-	119	-

SCHOOLS	# OF S.	TJ			Math Comprehension Grade Level							TJ			# OF S.N.G.	G.B.
		PP	P	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		
1.ARTS					RESOURCE ROOMS OMITTED FROM ASSESSMENT											
2.BARRINGER	75	4	1	2	11	20	11	8	3	–	–	–	–	–	15	–
3.BARRINGER P.	43	–	–	21	6	4	3	1	2	–	1	–	–	–	5	–
4.BROADWAY M.						ASSESSED IN THE GREEN BRIGANCE										
5.CENTRAL	94	–	–	1	29	18	9	5	5	2	–	–	–	–	25	–
6.EAST SIDE	88	–	5	5	20	15	10	17	3	2	1	–	–	–	10	–
7.SHABAZZ	67	–	–	2	26	19	9	4	2	1	1	–	–	–	1	2
8.UNIVERSITY	78	–	–	–	24	17	13	8	1	–	1	–	–	–	14	–
9.WEEQUAHIC	58	–	1	–	19	14	8	4	2	1	–	–	–	–	9	–
10.WEST SIDE	41	–	1	2	15	9	3	2	–	1	1	–	–	–	7	–
11.WEST KINNEY	107	–	–	8	51	33	13	12	1	–	–	–	–	–	21	–
CENTER SCHOOLS																
12.ARLINGTON	37	–	–	1	8	4	–	4	1	–	–	–	–	–	19	–
13.F. PATTERSON	32	–	–	–	11	7	2	4	3	–	–	–	–	–	5	–
14.MONTGOMERY	198	4	2	9	74	27	5	8	1	1	–	–	–	–	67	–

APPENDIX F

PROJECT SYSTEM SUCCESS RATING FORM

System Success Student Rating Form

Dear System Success Student:

As part of our evaluation of System Succes we are asking you to give us some feedback on your participation in the program this year. We are asking you to rate the following activities.

---

1) How satisfied were you with the small group discussions:

1) very satisfied
2) satisfied
3) not sure
4) dissatisfied
5) very dissatisfied

2) How satisfied were you with the guest speakers:

1) very satisfied
2) satisfied
3) not sure
4) dissatisfied
5) very dissatisfied

3) How satisfied were you with the fields trips you went on:

1) very satisfied
2) satisfied
3) not sure
4) dissatisfied
5) very dissatisfied

4) How satisfied were you with the recreational activities which you participated in at the YWCA:

1) very satisfied
2) satisfied
3) not sure
4) dissatisfied
5) very dissatisfied

5) Name three things you enjoyed participating in the most during the school year (Be specific).

1) ______________________

2) ______________________

3) ______________________

6) Do you have any suggestions on ways to improve the Program next year?

APPENDIX G

PROJECT SYSTEM SUCCESS TRIP SUMMARY FORM

6/5/90

SYSTEM SUCCESS BARRINGER HIGH SCHOOL -
TITLE VI B P.L. 94 142
TRIP SUMMARY FORM

SCHOOL: Barringer High

DESTINATION: Newark "Y"

DEPARTURE TIME: 2:30

RETURN TIME: 5:30

NUMBER OF BUSES: 1

NUMBER OF STUDENTS: 15

COMMENTS:

On Tuesday, fifteen students from B.H.SS program were treated to a physical fitness extravaganza. It seems the students felt the need to work off some post examination frustrations. They utilized every facet of the Newark "Y" and at the conclusion of the program were exhausted. It was a very productive day both socially and emotionally for the students. I hope that enthusiasm level will be there on Friday for our Union Market excursion.

PRINCIPAL'S SIGNATURE J. Iannuzzi

TEACHER'S SIGNATURE Philp Hamilton

(1) Garfield Block
(2) Angel Castro
(3) Auselmo Gonzalez
(4) Lamont Leaf
(5) Robert Lewis
(6) David Martinez
(7) Raul Melendez
(8) Jennifer Montalvo
(9) Jose Ortiz
(10) Javier Rosario
(11) Jose Reyes
(12) Albert Padin
(13) Rabb Wall
(14) Sapheum Teagul
(15) Coleman Williams

Note: This form has been retyped for ease of reading.

APPENDIX H

PROJECT COPE FORM

COPE COUNSELING

School: Samuel Berliner

Counselor: Joyce Fortson

Student:	Case#	Date	Type of Service
Andrew Denton	85-02-131	9/89-6/90	I
David Williams	83-04-050	10/89-6/90	I
Lawrence Washington	88-03-144	9/89-3/90	I
Franky Valentin	83-02-100	10/89-3/90	I
Tarnicia Johnson	81-01-076	10/89-6/90	I
Al-Rashid Dollard	8 -11-021	10/89-4/90	I
Shawn Brown	89-02-086	10-89-3/89	I
Marco Pais	85-05-014	9/89-6/90	I
Damon Cato	85-11-052	9/89-3/90	I
James Boyle	85-04-112	10/89-5/90	I
Fuquan Hills	88-03-014	9/89-3/90	I
Amina Parker	88-11-034	9/89-6/90	I
Alquemar Anderson	88-10-045	10/89-6/90	I
Carlos Espino	83-10-116	10/89-1/90	I
Douglas Bolden	89-01-099	9/89-6/90	I
Altarik Alston	87-02-076	11/89-5/90	I
Manuel Rodriguez	88-12-074	9/89-6/90	I
Antonio Mitchell	86-12-097	9/89-2/90	I
Alexander Romero	89-09-015	9/89-6/90	I
Ronald Mobley	89-07-011	1/90-6/90	I
Jeffrey Bardge	85-01-017	10/89-6/90	I
Albert Hughes	85-05-007	1/90-5/90	I
Michael Jones	88-03-003	2/90-6/90	I
Kevin Creech	86-03-170	2/90-6/90	I
John Harley	87-12-047	10/89/4/90	I
Gary Cook	90-01-034	3/90-5/90	I
Antoine Randall	84-06-077	9/89-1/90	I
Hakim Currie	85-04-050	11/89-2/90	I
Marcus Anderson	85-05-104	10/89-6/90	I
Edward Simmons	88-03-030	3/90-6/90	I
Kaasiem Johnson	83-12-004	9/90-1/90	I
Jovan Chester	88-04-147	10/89-1/90	I
Edwin Ramirez	84-01-040	2/90-6/90	I

* I = individual Counseling; G = Group Counseling; S =support service

APPENDIX I

PROJECT PERSONNEL AND PARENT TRAINING NEEDS ASSESSMENT

OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION SUPPORT SERVICES

COMPREHENSIVE SYSTEM OF PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

SPRING 1990

COMPREHENSIVE SYSTEM OF PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT
NEEDS ASSESSMENT
SPRING 1990

I. NEEDS ASSESSMENT

A. Method

A questionnaire developed by the Special Education Media Center was sent to each of the target groups in the subject pool. People were asked to indicate their present job title. Respondents were asked to indicate preferred incentives from a choice of ten (10) and needs for technical assistance by checking specific topics within each major area. The major areas are indicated below.

1.00 Understanding Statutes And Regulations Covering Education Of The Handicapped

2.00 Individual Educational Plan

3.00 Informal Diagnosis And Assessment

4.00 Organizing The Classroom For Instruction

5.00 Planning For Instruction

6.00 Facilitating And Implementing Instructional Programs

7.00 Discipline

8.00 Management Skills

Analysis

Data was analyzed according to five major factors and areas of need (frequency cou of each topic indicated the priority of need for technical assistance in that area

Table 1: RANKING OF TOPICS INDICATING NEED FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Table 2: RANKING ACROSS TOPICS INDICATING NEED FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Frequency counts were calculated by summing the number of responses for any given topic area; prioritization was determined by rank ordering topics according to frequency (1= high priority ((greatest frequency))
(2= next highest priority ((next greatest frequency)), etc.)

Needs Assessment Data

Each of the areas specified in the questionnaire are reported upon in Tables 1-2. Each of the tables include frequency and/or priority ratings of the topics. Data is reported for each topical area and across topical areas.

The survey was distributed to special education teachers (478) and principals (80 special education. The returns from these two groups were as follows:

_283 Special Education Teachers

__24 Principals

RANKING OF TOPICS INDICATING NEED FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

RANK			NO NEED 1	2	3	4	HIGH NEED 5	N
1.00	UNDERSTANDING STATUTES AND REGULATIONS COVERING EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED							
4	1.01	Understanding the requirements of the New Jersey Administrative Code, Chapter 6:28* and Public Law 94-142 terminology	36	30	89	58	87	
3	1.02	Familiarity with instructional placement options (least restrictive environment)	28	44	84	64	83	
1	1.03	Understanding Child Study Team evaluation procedures	23	25	73	69	107	
2	1.04	Understanding student referral procedures	29	29	63	87	87	
2.00	INDIVIDUAL EDUCATIONAL PLAN							
2	2.01	Knowledge of the Individual Educational Plan (IEP): Basic Plan (BP)/Instructional Guide (IG) components	36	44	74	66	83	
1	2.02	Understanding of the teacher's role in the development of the IEP/BEP	39	35	65	67	95	
3.00	INFORMAL DIAGNOSIS AND ASSESSMENT							
2	3.01	Utilizing the Brigance (Red, Green, Orange)	35	29	87	76	74	
4	3.02	Using and keeping anecdotal records	33	42	97	71	58	
3	3.03	Designing and using teacher made test	40	37	87	70	66	
1	3.04	Collecting information about pupil learning styles	24	21	65	93	99	
4.00	ORGANIZING THE CLASSROOM FOR INSTRUCTION							
3	4.01	Planning for classroom management, (establishing routines, rules, daily procedures, and orderly operation of classroom)	36	40	60	60	110	
2	4.02	Establishing an environment which motivates learning	27	29	60	73	114	
1	4.03	Selection and organization of resources and materials for effective instruction	18	25	53	91	116	

RANK			NO NEED			HIGH NEED		
			1	2	3	4	5	N
5.00	PLANNING FOR INSTRUCTION							
	5.01	Utilizing the components of the Newark Special Education Instructional Support System						
8		A. Plan Book	33	42	78	74	61	
9		B. Class Reference Chart	48	53	84	65	50	
7		C. Board of Education Curriculums	34	39	80	82	68	
6	5.02	Identifying goals and writing/selecting objectives appropriate to pupils needs as specified in the IEP	30	40	68	79	72	
3	5.03	Grouping students appropriately	28	43	54	86	84	
1	5.04	Individualizing instruction	28	36	61	90	82	
5	5.05	Utilizing the 5-step lesson design (Introduction, Demonstration, Guided Practice, Closure, Independent Practice	20	38	86	82	75	
4	5.06	Selecting/developing instructional materials	18	34	84	100	67	
2	5.07	Utilizing instructional time effectively	26	37	63	89	81	
6.00	FACILITATING AND IMPLEMENTING INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS							
1	6.01	Employing a variety of appropriate teaching strategies and techniques	17	25	69	103	88	
2	6.02	Utilizing a variety of instructional materials and resources	17	28	77	100	80	
8	6.03	Using teacher aides effectively	40	41	73	66	79	
7	6.04	Providing clear and explicit direction to students	41	38	79	65	78	
6	6.05	Utilizing effective questioning techniques and strategies	29	37	75	87	70	
3	6.06	Interacting and communicating effectively with parents and community	25	32	74	86	82	
4	6.07	Collaboratively working with administrative staff	27	39	71	78	80	
5	6.08	Developing positive working relationships with support personnel, (Speech Correctionist, Psychologist, Learning Disability Consultant, Social Worker and others)	32	36	74	73	85	

			NO NEED			HIGH NEED		
RANK			1	2	3	4	5	NR
7.00	DISCIPLINE							
_1_	7.01	Establishing an environment which encourages self-awareness and positive self concept in students	_23	_25	_48	_82	125	_
_2_	7.02	Developing an appropriate system of rules and consequences	_22	_34	_54	_83	110	_
_3_	7.03	Selecting and implementing appropriate reinforcers	_20	_24	_72	_84	103	_
8.00	MANAGEMENT SKILLS							
_1_	8.01	Maintaining accurate and complete records as required by district policy and state statutes and regulations	_29	_28	_77	_77	_91	_
_2_	8.02	Assisting in determining an planning staff development programs	_21	_30	_82	_87	_73	_1

TOP TEN RANKING AREAS NEEDING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

RANK

1 - 7.01 Establishing an environment which encourages self awareness and positive self concept in students

2 - 4.03 Selection and organization of resources and materials for effective instruction

3 - 7.02 Developing an appropriate system of rules and consequences

4 - 3.04 Collecting information about pupil learning styles

5 - 6.01 Employing a variety of appropriate teaching strategies and techniques

6 - 7.03 Selecting and implementing appropriate reinforcers

7 - 4.02 Establishing an environment which motivates learning

8 - 6.02 Utilizing a variety of instructional materials and resources

9 - 1.03 Understanding Child Study Team evaluation procedures

10 - 1.04 Understanding student referral procedures

INCENTIVES FOR PARTICIPATION

A. Assuming in-service activities will be offered on an ongoing basis, what incentives would encourage you to participate?

RANK		High			Low	NR
2	College Credit	173	41	19	29	45
3	Advance Credit	154	60	12	20	61
1	Desire to improve skills	198	63	16	12	18
6	Opportunity to Receive Peer Training	76	72	59	32	68
8	Release Time	70	45	63	62	67

RANK		High		Low		NR
9	Summer Workshops	41	51	66	86	_
7	District Recognition	67	69	58	50	_
5	Certificate of Accomplishment	89	69	54	44	_
4	Commendation in Personnel Folder	102	72	49	36	_

SECTION 111

The purpose of this section is to gather information that will be utilized to plan and offer in-service courses and workshops for teachers.

Are there some things you like to learn to do more effectively? What are they? Please revi the responsibilities and activities listed below by making a number from 1 (low desire) to 5 (high desire).

			NO NEED			HIGH NEED		
RANK			1	2	3	4	5	N
1.00	UNDERSTANDING STATUTES AND REGULATIONS COVERING EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED							
29	1.01	Understanding the requirements of the New Jersey Administrative Code, Chapter 6:28* and Public Law 94-142 terminology	36	30	89	58	87	_
28	1.02	Familiarity with instructional placement options (least restrictive environment)	28	44	84	64	83	_
9	1.03	Understanding Child Study Team evaluation procedures	23	25	73	69	107	_
10	1.04	Understanding student referral procedures	29	29	63	87	87	_
2.00	INDIVIDUAL EDUCATIONAL PLAN							
27	2.01	Knowledge of the Individual Educational Plan (IEP): Basic Plan (BP)/Instructional Guide (IG) components	36	44	74	66	83	_
18	2.02	Understanding of the teacher's role in the development of the IEP/BEP	39	35	65	67	95	_

RANK			NO NEED 1	2	3	4	HIGH NEED 5	NR
3.00	INFORMAL DIAGNOSIS AND ASSESSMENT							
25	3.01	Utilizing the Brigance (Red, Green, Orange)	35	29	87	76	74	
34	3.02	Using and keeping anecdotal records	33	42	97	71	58	
32	3.03	Designing and using teacher made test	40	37	87	70	66	
4	3.04	Collecting information about pupil learning styles	24	21	65	93	99	
4.00	ORGANIZING THE CLASSROOM FOR INSTRUCTION							
14	4.01	Planning for classroom management, (establishing routines, rules, daily procedures, and orderly operation of classroom)	36	40	60	60	110	
7	4.02	Establishing an environment which motivates learning	27	29	60	73	114	
2	4.03	Selection and organization of resources and materials for effective instruction	18	25	53	91	116	
5.00	PLANNING FOR INSTRUCTION							
	5.01	Utilizing the components of the Newark Special Education Instructional Support System						
33		A. Plan Book	33	42	78	74	61	
35		B. Class Reference Chart	48	53	84	65	50	
26		C. Board of Education Curriculums	34	39	80	82	68	
24	5.02	Identifying goals and writing/selecting objectives appropriate to pupils needs as specified in the IEP	30	40	68	79	72	
12	5.03	Grouping students appropriately	28	43	54	86	84	
11	5.04	Individualizing instruction	28	36	61	90	82	
22	5.05	Utilizing the 5-step lesson design (Introduction, Demonstration, Guided Practice, Closure, Independent Practice	20	38	86	82	75	

			NO NEED				HIGH NEED	
RANK			1	2	3	4	5	NR
17	5.06	Selecting/developing instructional materials	18	34	84	100	67	
13	5.07	Utilizing instructional time effectively	26	37	63	89	81	
6.00	FACILITATING AND IMPLEMENTING INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS							
5	6.01	Employing a variety of appropriate teaching strategies and techniques	17	25	69	103	88	
8	6.02	Utilizing a variety of instructional materials and resources	17	28	77	100	80	
30	6.03	Using teacher aides effectively	40	41	73	66	79	
31	6.04	Providing clear and explicit direction to students	41	38	79	65	78	
23	6.05	Utilizing effective questioning techniques and strategies	29	37	75	87	70	
16	6.06	Interacting and communicating effectively with parents and community	25	32	74	86	82	
21	6.07	Collaboratively working with administrative staff	27	39	71	78	80	
20	6.08	Developing positive working relationships with support personnel, (Speech Correctionist, Psychologist, Learning Disability Consultant, Social Worker and others)	32	36	74	73	85	
7.00	DISCIPLINE							
1	7.01	Establishing an environment which encourages self-awareness and positive self concept in students	23	25	48	82	125	
3	7.02	Developing an appropriate system of rules and consequences	22	34	54	83	110	
6	7.03	Selecting and implementing appropriate reinforcers	20	24	72	84	103	
8.00	MANAGEMENT SKILLS							
15	8.01	Maintaining accurate and complete records as required by district policy and state statutes and regulations	29	28	77	77	91	
19	8.02	Assisting in determining an planning staff development programs	21	30	82	87	73	

APPENDIX J

PROJECT INTERVENTION
PRE-SCHOOL HANDICAPPED LOCATION SITES

PROJECT INTERVENTION
PRE-SCHOOL HANDICAPPED

School Location Sites

Abington Avenue (268-5230), 209 Abington Avenue, 07107
Principal: Walter Afflitto — PSH Team I

2 PSH classes..........................Teacher, Judy Logan
Assistant, Barbara Hawkins

Boylan Street (374-2490), 15 Boylan Street, 07107
Principal: Fern Richardson — PSH Team I

2 PSH classes..........................Teacher, Marie Pinckney
Assistant, Virginia McCoy

2 PSH classes..........................Teacher, Cynthia Goldberg
Assistant, Clara Young-Hall

Branch Brook (268-5220), 228 Ridge Street 07104
Principal: John Lillis — PSH Team I

2 PSH classes..........................Teacher, Patricia Yskamp
Assistant, Florence Mongiello

Bruce Street (705-3952), 333 Clinton Place, 07112
Principal: Margaret Herron — Bruce Street Team

1 All Day class........................Teacher, Eleanor Evans
Assistant, Virginia Sims

Camden Street (733-6994), 299 Camden Street, 07103
Principal: Michael Pallante — PSH Team I

2 PSH classes..........................Teacher, Eloise Darby-Thomas
Assistant, Maritza Martinez

2 PSH classes..........................Teacher, Ola Kidd
Assistant, Mima Gonzalez

Clinton Avenue (733-6970), 534 Clinton Avenue, 07108
Principal: Zelma Collins — PSH Team II

2 PSH classes..........................Teacher, Annie King
Assistant, Patsy Zackery

John F. Kennedy (733-6788), 311 South 11th Street, 07103

2 PSH classes..........................Teacher, Susan Kreisinger
Assistant, Josephine Motley

McKinley (268-5270), 1 Colonnade Place, 07104
Principal: Louis Giordano PSH Team II (English)
PSH Team III (Spanish)

2 PSH classes (English)................Teacher, Leveda Robinson
Assistant, Diane Carswell

2 PSH classes (Spanish)................Teacher, Elisa Rosa
Assistant, Amalia Delvalle

Thirteenth Avenue (733-7045), 359 - 13th Avenue, 07103
Principal: Bert Berry PSH Team II

2 PSH classes..........................Teacher, Connie Jones
Assistant, Era Dunnell

APPENDIX K

PROJECT INTERVENTION
TRANSITIONAL KINDERGARTEN LOCATION SITES

NEWARK BOARD OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF CHILD GUIDANCE AND PLACEMENT
2 CEDAR STREET
NEWARK, NEW JERSEY 07102-3091
(201) 733-7317

EUGENE C. CAMPBELL
EXECUTIVE SUPERINTENDENT

GRACE WALLS
DIRECTOR

TRANSITIONAL KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

SCHOOL SITES

Abington Avenue (268-5230, 209 Abington Avenue 07107
Principal: Walter Afflitto

1 TK Class:
Teacher, Susan Muessig
Assistant, Ida Lindsey

Camden Street (733-6994), 281 Camden Street 07103
Principal: Michael Pallante

3 TK Classes:
Teacher, Anita Mauterer
Assistant, Miriam Figueroa

Teacher, Jancice Day
Assistant, Bill Rutan

Teacher, Lorraine Crawford
Assistant, Kim McCullough

Clinton Avenue (733-8301), 534 Clinton Avenue 07108
Principal: Zelma Collins

2 TK Classes:
Teacher, Angela Green
Assistant, Delois Donna

Teacher, Ann Scott
Assistant, Elinora Croom

McKinley (268-5270), 1 Colonnade Place 07104
Principal: Louis Giordano

1 TK Classes:
(Bilingual)
Teacher, Ann Rivera
Assistant, Milagros Negron

SCHOOL SITES

Thirteenth Avenue (733-7045), 359- 13th Street 07103
Principal: Bert Berry

2 TK Classes:

Teacher, Frank Riccio
Assistant, Ethel Cunningham

Teacher, Sharon Bressler
Assistant, Ernestine Scarborough

Resource Room:

Teacher, Thomas Peacock

APPENDIX L

PROJECT INTERVENTION
LIST OF COMMUNITY AGENCIES

COMMUNITY SERVICE FAIR
Parent Center
Thirteenth Avenue School
November 28, 1989

List of Agencies/Projects Involved

Agency	Representative
ASPIRA	Hilda Rosario
Association for Retarded Citzens	Leslie Bezak, Director Home Assistance and Respite Care Programs
Babyland Nursery	Martha Carroll and Mary Smith
Boland Rehabilitative and Training Center	Edda Swart, Director
Catholic Community Services	Sr. Rose Phillips Social Ministry for Essex County
Division of Youth & Family Services	Sharilyn Allah Resource Development Specialist
Emergency Food Program	Sharon Reilly Tobin, Director & Catherine L. Insalata
Essex County College	Eileen O'Connor, Director Wise Womens Center
FOCUS	Jose Morales, Director & Jeannette Colon
Leaguers Early Childhood Center	Claudette Martindale Health Special Education Coordinator
Martland Emergency Shelter	Irma Jenkins, Direcor
Newark Board of Education Division of Adult Education	Anthony DiUbaldi, Director Anthony Manochi, Assistant Director
Newark PreSchool Council, Inc.	Gloria Washington, Director Social Services Specialist & Ellen Feldman, Coordinator of Education and Special Services

New Community Corporation	Gwendolyn Long, Executive Director of Human Services
New Community Corporation Employment Center	Tania McKoy, Administrator
Office of Children (Day Care)	Marica Schoolmaster Senior Program Analyst
Special Child Health Services	Mildred Williams, Director

APPENDIX M

PROJECT INTERVENTION
1989-1990 ANNUAL STATISTICS REPORT

Statistics

Referral statistics are presented in totals only. Maintaining accurate monthly statistics became extremely difficult due to the frequent lapse of time between a verbal and written referral (verbal referrals were not accepted for the purpose of activating a case).

As the program is in constant progress, figures are divided into referrals for the current school year and those for the coming school year:

	1989/90	1990/91
PSH	135	98
TK	25	73
total	160	total 171
(bilingual)	(23)	(26)

Total Number of Children Served in Indistrict Classes:

PSH	165
TK	63
Total	229

Resource Room 15

Total Number of Children Served in Out of District Classes:

24

APPENDIX N

PROJECT INTERVENTION
SUMMER CAMP FAIR PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

PARTICIPANTS
FOR
SUMMER CAMP FAIR PROGRAM
Scheduled for Monday
May 7, 1990

Samac Ali, Associate Director
c/o Leaguers International Youth Organization
703 South 12th Street
Newark. New Jersey 07103
824-5900

Sharilyn Allan. Community Resource Specialist
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES
c/o Division of Youth & Family Services
1100 Raymond Boulevard - Room 209
Newark, New Jersey 07102
648-7759/4978

Sr. Mary Ellen Bernstein
Director of Babyland III
200 South Orange Avenue
Newark, New Jersey 07103
623-8016

Julius Blanton, Manager
c/o Friendly Fuld Neighborhood Centers
71 Boyd Street
Newark. New Jersey 07103
642-2747

Marguerite Bush, Director
c/o The Clinton Hill YMWCA Preschool
420 Hawthorne Avenue
Newark, New Jersey 07112
374-9032

Joyce S. Carter. Program Director
Quest-Essex County CYC
111-19 Sussex Avenue
Newark. New Jersey 07103
621-8206

Valerie James. Camp Director
Division of Recreation/Cultural Affairs
920 Broad Street - Room "B-33"
Newark, New Jersey 07102
733-3940 Central Office / 697-2850 Camp Watershed

Randi Kaufman, Speech & Language Department
Newark Beth Israel Medical Center
201 Lyons Avenue
Newark, New Jersey 07112
926-7645

SUMMER CAMP FAIR PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

Colleen Kunz, Director
c/o Essex County Park Commission
321 Eagle Rock Avenue
Roseland, New Jersey
229-2210/482-6400

Claudette Martindale, Health Special Education Coordinator
c/o The Leaguers Early Childhood Center
Symphony Hall - 4th Floor
1020 Broad Street
Newark, New Jersey 07102
643-0357/375-6840

Rosanne Morey, Director of Public Relations
c/o Youth Consultation Service
284 Broadway
Newark, New Jersey 07104
482-8411

Marcia Schoolmaster, Senior Program Analyst
c/o Office of Children
110 William Streest
Newark, New Jersey 07102
733-7973

Edward Small, Branch Manager
c/o Vailsburg Library
75 Alexander Street
Newark, New Jersey 07106
733-7755

Sr. Marie Thornton
Assistant Superintendent of School for Essex County
100 Lincen Avenue
Irvington, New Jersey 07111
596-4250

Lucy Voorhees, Assistant Director of Education
c/o Newark Museum
49 Washington Street
P.O. Box 540
Newark, New Jersey 07101
596-6547

Barbara Wallace, Child Care Director
c/o Tri-City People's Corp.
675 South 19th Street
Newark, New Jersey 07103
374-5252

APPENDIX O

NON EVALUATED PROJECTS

PERFORMANCE AND EQUIPMENT REPORT
FLOW-THROUGH FUNDS

FY 90 Flow-Through ☒
FY 89 Carry-Over ☐
(P.L. 94-142 only)

Flow-Through (FT)
Ages 3 - 21 (P.L. 94-142)
Flow-Though (PS)
Ages 3 -5 (P.L. 99-457)

PROJECT NUMBER: FT 3570-90
INDIVIDUAL ☒
CONSOLIDATED ☐

1. Agency: Newark Board of Education
1a. County: Essex
2. Chief School Administrator: Eugene C. Campbell
2a. Telephone: 201-733-7333
3. Address: 2 Cedar St., Newark, New Jersey 07102
4. Project Title: StaffUp
5. Duration: FROM 9-1-89 TO 6-30-90
6. Number of Students:
7. Funds Awarded for FY $
7a. Funds Approved for FY Carry-over: $

8. Report of Completed Activities (Attach additional sheets if necessary).

Project Staff-Up is necessitated by the size of the LEA Grant as the complexity of various projects' missions and multi-site locations. This project has been organized to develop a comprehensive mechanism by which the LEA can monitor effectively all Title VI-B Funded Flow Through Grants. Project Staff-Up is designed to provide the least burden on the total district allocation while assisting in ensuring maximum utilization of individual projects. It serves as a quality control unit whose operation will assure strict compliance with P.L. 94-142 objectives, district policies and state/federal guidelines. It allows for funding accountability fiscal monitoring and coordination of services. It serves both as a program and an overall budget system of accountability.

OBJECTIVES

A. To provide Title VI-B Flow Through information to the LEA Controller's Office for internal audits;

B. To prepare and inititate expenditure proposals for personnel, equipment and supplies in accordance with senior management directives:

C. To maintain all pertinent Title VI-B Flow Through Records; and

D. To make recommendations to the Assistant Executive Superintendent for Pupil Personnel Services regarding budgetary expenditures for current and future programs.

ACTIVITIES

The supervisor performed, but was not restricted to, the following activities:
1) Preparation for LEA approval all state and District mandated documents regarding 94-142 Flow Through Funding;
2) Initiated requisitions for the purchase of materials and equipment which has been approved by the LEA and SEA;

I certify that this report is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge.

9. Chief School Administrator:

(Signature) Date:

3) coordinated the busing components for the after school programs;
4) Developed for management approval, job descriptions for Title VI-B After School Programs;
5) Prepared correspondence regarding Title VI-B Activities for the Assistant Executive Superintendent in charge of the Department of Pupil Personnel Services.
6) Prepared and organized Title VI-B Application Requests for District and State Department of Education approval;
7) Modified Title VI-B Grants throughout the year for maximum utilization of funds; and
8) Coordinated activities and implementation procedures for all Title VI-B Projects.

PERFORMANCE AND EQUIPMENT REPORT
FLOW-THROUGH FUNDS

FY 90 Flow-Through ☒
FY 89 Carry-Over ☐
(P.L. 94-142 only)

Flow-Through (FT)
Ages 3 - 21 (P.L. 94-142)
Flow-Though (PS)
Ages 3 -5 (P.L. 99-457)

PROJECT NUMBER: FT 3570-90

INDIVIDUAL ☒
CONSOLIDATED ☐

1. Agency: Newark Board of Education
1a. County: Essex
2. Chief School Administrator: Eugene C. Campbell
2a. Telephone: 201-733-7333
3. Address: 2 Cedar St., Newark, New Jersey 07102
4. Project Title: Instructional Aides
5. Duration: FROM 9-1-89 TO 8-31-90
6. Number of Students: 120
7. Funds Awarded for FY $ ______
7a. Funds Approved for FY Carry-over: $ ______

8. Report of Completed Activities (Attach additional sheets if necessary).

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Title IV-B Classroom Aides serve to increase the quality of instruction in special education classes, improve the ability to individualize instruction and allow for necessary increases in class sizes.

OBJECTIVES:

1. To relieve teachers of non-teaching duties so as to allow more direct teaching time for students.
2. To decrease the staff-student ratio in order to better individualized instruction.
3. To assist with the general supervision of students and the management of problem behaviors.
4. To reduce or eliminate the waiting list of student to be placed in Special Education classes by allowing for a proportionate increase in class sizes as provided for in New Jersey Administrative Code 6:28, Special Education Code.

ACTIVITIES:

1. Develop, distribute, post and store teaching aides and materials.
2. Assist with grading student papers and with keeping records as required.
3. Assist with separating and maintaining equipment designed to enhance classroom instruction.
4. Assist with supervision of students and management of student behavior.
5. Assist with small group and individual instruction.

I certify that this report is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge.

9. Chief School Administrator:

(Signature) ______ Date: ______

ROLES OF PERSONNEL IN FULFILLING PROJECT GOALS:

Fourteen 6 Hour Classroom Aides have been assigned to Special Education classes throughout the District in order to assist teachers with providing instruction to educationally handicapped students. The range of academic functioning among the students is quite diverse and frequently requires individualized and very small group instruction. Teacher Aides also assist with managing the problem behaviors which often accompany the handicapping conditions. The presence of teacher aide in the classroom reduces the time which a teacher must devote to maintaining and managing classroom logistics, thus providing more direct teaching time for students.

The Office of Special Education Support Services has been faced with a shortage of classroom space for students with handicapping conditions. As a result, students have frequently had to wait for extended periods of time to be placed in special classrooms. The addition of classroom aides allows for increases in class sizes and subsequent reduction in placement waiting time.

[illegible] APPENDIX

PERFORMANCE AND EQUIPMENT REPORT
FLOW-THROUGH FUNDS

90 Flow-Through ☐
89 Carry-Over ☐
(P.L. 94-142 only)

Flow-Through (FT)
Ages 3 - 21 (P.L. 94-142)

Flow-Though (PS)
Ages 3 -5 (P.L. 99-457)

PROJECT NUMBER: FT 3570-90

INDIVIDUAL ☒
CONSOLIDATED ☐

1. Agency: Newark Board of Education
1a. County: Essex
2. Chief School Administrator: Eugene C. Campbell
2a. Telephone: 201-733-7333
3. Address: 2 Cedar St., Newark, New Jersey 07102
4. Project Title:
5. Duration: FROM 9-1-89 TO 8-31-90
6. Number of Students:
7. Funds Awarded for FY $ ________
7a. Funds Approved for FY Carry-over: $ ________

8. Report of Completed Activities (Attach additional sheets if necessary).

TITLE VI - B FINAL REPORT FY 89/90
CHILD GUIDANCE AND PLACEMENT - BILINGUAL CHILD STUDY TEAM

The Title VI-B, Bilingual Child Study Team served in several capacities and performed several major functions during the 89/90 FY.

1. The bilingual child study team served as an itinerant team and administered the necessary discipline evaluations and held eligibility determination conferences for potentially handicapped bilingual pupils and/or pupils in need of mandated three year reevaluations in school settings where bilingual CST personnel were not available.

   For those pupils determined eligible for special education and related services, the bilingual child study team secured placement and developed the individualized educational programs. (See attachment - Itinerant Services)

2. The bilingual child study team also served as the Preschool Bilingual Child Study Team for the district. (See attachment - Preschool Services)

   The preschool bilingual child study team:

   a. administered the necessary evaluations and held eligibility determination conferences for potentially handicapped pupils being considered for the PSH and MH/TK programs.

certify that this report is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge.

9. Chief School Administrator:

Signature) ________ Date: ________

b. secured placement and developed IEP's for those pupils determined to be eligible for special education and related services under the classifications of PSH and MH/TK.

c. administered and secured all necessary evaluations for pupils exiting the PSH and the MH/TK programs and held eligibility determination conferences to plan for the pupils future educational programming.

For those pupils determined to be eligible for continued participation in special education, the bilingual child study team determined the appropriate classification, developed the IEP and secured placements.

d. completed annual reviews to update the IEP's for those handicapped pupils determined eligible to continue in the PSH program.

e. screened bilingual children referred through community agencies for September, 1990 placement in newly created transitional kindergarten programs. (See attachments - Preschool Screening Services)

3. In the belief that bilingual services were required, the bilingual child study team was assigned to a densely populated Hispanic school. However, the resulting referrals did not appear to justify this perception, consequently, the bilingual child study team was reassigned full time to preschool services and itinerant services. (See attachments - Sussex Avenue School)

The Title VI-B bilingual child study team also served in the following, additional capacities as warranted by district and community needs:

1. researched, evaluated and secured testing materials deemed appropriate for the targeted bilingual population.

2. participated in the development and translation of new forms and procedures required because of new law and division reorganization.

3 served as a liaison between parents and personnel in targeted special education placement settings for bilingual handicapped pupils.

4. intervened as a professional resource in addressing and resolving problematic bilingual cases on an emergency basis.

5. attended professional workshops, i.e., revised Woodcock-Johnsom, 1/25/90, Aids and the Preschooler, 10/26/90.

FLOW-THROUGH FUNDS

FY 90 Flow-Through ☒
FY 89 Carry-Over ☐
(P.L. 94-142 only)

Flow-Through (FT)
Ages 3 - 21 (P.L. 94-142)

Flow-Though (PS)
Ages 3 -5 (P.L. 99-457)

PROJECT NUMBER: FT 3570-90

INDIVIDUAL ☒
CONSOLIDATED ☐

1. Agency: Newark Board of Education
1a. County: Essex
2. Chief School Administrator: Eugene C. Campbell
2a. Telephone: 201-733-7333
3. Address: 2 Cedar St., Newark, New Jersey 07102
4. Project Title: Supervision
5. Duration: FROM 9-1-89 TO 8-31-90
6. Number of Students:
7. Funds Awarded for FY $ ____________
7a. Funds Approved for FY Carry-over: $ ____________

8. Report of Completed Activities (Attach additional sheets if necessary).

Project Description: Title VI-B, Project Supervision provides for additional supervision of special education teachers and speech/language specialists. It also improves the data gathering and information reporting capability of the Division of Special Education.

OBJECTIVES:

1. To improve the scope and quality of supervision of special education teachers.
2. To improve the scope and quality of supervision of speech/language specialists.
3. To improve the data collection, record keeping and reporting capability of the Division of Special Education for students serviced by special education teachers and speech/language correctionists.

ACTIVITIES:

1. Observation and supervision of instruction provided by special education teachers.
2. Provide instruction for teachers regarding the improvement of instruction and classroom management techniques.
3. Observing and supervising speech/language services as delivered by speech correctionists.
4. Providing instruction for speech correctionists regarding improvement of the delivery of speech/language services.
5. Conducting and participating in workshops, inservice sessions and conferences for staff and parents.
6. Assisting with routine data gathering activities such as the Special Education Plan (Title VI-B and the Application for State Aid).

I certify that this report is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge.

9. Chief School Administrator:

(Signature) ______________________________ Date: ______________

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ROLE OF PERSONNEL IN FULFILLING PROJECT GOALS:

1. Ms. Judith McCabe, a Project Supervisor for the Division of Special Education is responsible for the direct supervision of 150 special education teachers. She provides technical assistance in the areas of classroom management, planning and the instructional process.

2. Mr. Harry Lauer has been responsible for scheduling, supervising, observing and developing 51 Speech/Language Correctionists. Additionally he has assumed responsibility for supervising 50 Special Education Teachers.

The Office of Special Education Support Services, for the 1989-90 school year, has targeted the development of special education teachers in the areas of classroom management, planning and instruction to improve the delivery of services to classified students. There are approximately 500 special education teachers and 51 speech correctionists requiring supervision. The employment of Ms. McCabe and Mr. Lauer will enable the department to handle this task by argumenting the present staff of two supervisors.

PERFORMANCE AND EQUIPMENT REPORT
FLOW-THROUGH FUNDS

FY 90 Flow-Through ☐
FY 89 Carry-Over ☐
(P.L. 94-142 only)

Flow-Through (FT)
Ages 3 - 21 (P.L. 94-142)

Flow-Though (PS)
Ages 3 -5 (P.L. 99-457)

PROJECT NUMBER: FT 3570-90

INDIVIDUAL ☒
CONSOLIDATED ☐

1. Agency: Newark Board of Education
1a. County: Essex
2. Chief School Administrator: Eugene C. Campbell
2a. Telephone: 201-733-7333
3. Address: 2 Cedar St., Newark, New Jersey 07102
4. Project Title: Aides to Service the Multiple Handicapped
5. Duration: FROM 9-1-89 TO 8-31-90
6. Number of Students: 35
7. Funds Awarded for FY $ ____
7a. Funds Approved for FY Carry-over: $ ____

8. Report of Completed Activities (Attach additional sheets if necessary).

The project provides the individual instruction and self help training for students who have handicapping conditions requiring additional help in areas of mobility, gross motor skills, toileting, dressing and eating.

2 Graduates of John F. Kennedy School have been hired as the Aides, providing the graduates an opportunity to be productive.

Responsibilities of the Aides: All under the direction of the classroom teacher.

1. *Toilet training intervention.*
2. *Assisting students dress in outer clothing.*
3. *Assisting students dress for gym and swim.*
4. *Helping students develop good eating skills.*
5. *Assisting individual students in classroom activities.*
6. *Helping students move from various activities.*
7. *Assisting individual students on class trips.*

Classroom teachers supervise and structure the classroom activities according to the individual IEP's. The Aides provide 35 selected students with individual assistance. The additional intervention helps the students improve their self help skills and permits more active participation in the total school program.

Professional observation. IEP evaluations and parent conferences indicate students have shown improvement in areas of self help.

I certify that this report is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge.

9. Chief School Administrator:
(Signature) ____ Date: ____

FY 89/90 TITLE VI-B STUDENT ROSTER

PROJECT *Aides to Service the Multiply Handicapped*

SCHOOL *John F. Kennedy*

MONTH *June, 1990*

DISTRICT I.D. #	STUDENT NAME	CHILD GUIDANCE CASE#	CHAPTER I	E.S.L.	OTHER SERVICES
3570	Adams, Taheerah	84-07-019			Speech O.T.
	Baez, Andrew	88-09-046		X	Speech O.T.
	Black, Remone	84-06-071		X	Speech O.T
	Colondres, George	85-04-075		X	Speech P.T. & O.T.
	Galarza, Jeremiah	85-04-034			Speech O.T.
	Maldondo, Roberto	85-04-038		X	Speech O.T.
	McBean, Marlo	87-05-074			Speech O.T.
	Pinto, Melissa	87-04-136		X	Speech O.T.
	Sims, Lillian	84-07-053			Speech O.T.
	Torres, Hector	84-07-011		X	Speech O.T.
	Bell, Mustaffa	83-07-014			Speech O.T.
	Brown, Latoya	84-12-045			Speech O.T.
	Chalmers, Lashonda	83-03-138			Speech O.T.

FY 89/90 TITLE VI-B STUDENT ROSTER

PROJECT *Aides to Service the Multiply Handicapped*

SCHOOL *John F. Kennedy*

MONTH *June, 1990*

DISTRICT I.D. #	STUDENT NAME	CHILD GUIDANCE CASE#	CHAPTER I	E.S.L.	OTHER SERVICES
3570	DaCunha, Mario	83-04-023		X	Speech O.T.
	Gantt, Darius	82-09-077			Speech O.T.
	Hutchinson, Issac	85-09-046			Speech O.T.
	Jones, Christopher	83-09-071			Speech O.T.
	Yehudah, Naeaman	84-09-083			Speech O.T. & P.T.
	Winn, Safiya	89-09-151			Speech O.T.
	Alford, Shanta	85-09-104			Speech O.T.
	Brown, Nikita	86-04-080			Speech O.T.
	Cartagena, Yvonne	87-04-132		X	Speech O.T.
	Garvin, Thomas	Irvington			Speech O.T.
	Navarro, Michael	86-03-183			Speech O.T.
	Pierre, Richard	83-09-069			Speech O.T.
	Wadud, Kwesi	East Orange			Speech O.T.

FY 89/90 TITLE VI-B STUDENT ROSTER

PROJECT *Aid to Service the Multiply Handicapped*

SCHOOL *John F. Kennedy*

MONTH *June, 1990*

DISTRICT ID. #	STUDENT NAME	CHILD GUIDANCE CASE#	CHAPTER I	E.S.L.	OTHER SERVICES
3570	Corley, Rahim	85-09-016			Speech O.T.
	Riley, Altarique	82-04-036			Speech O.T.
	Rivera, Nelson	89-01-062		X	Speech O.T.
	Valentine, Emanuel	East Orange		X	Speech O.T.
	Dean, Denise	86-06-015			Speech O.T.
	Taylor, Kiana	Orange			Speech O.T.
	Ruela, David			X	Speech O.T.
	Elmore, Omar	82-09-046			Speech O.T.

APPENDIX P

THE COUNCIL FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

THE COUNCIL FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN'S
SPRING 1990
PRODUCTS AND SERVICES

Early Childhood Special Education: Birth to Three

Richness Through Diversity

Multicultural Symposia
October 18–20, 1990

Beyond Drill and Practice

College Planning for Gifted Students

CONTENTS

Membership Application 2
Membership Information 3
CEC Journals 3
Professional Development 4
Information Services 5
Early Childhood 6
Culturally Diverse/Bilingual 6
Career Education 7
Gifted and Talented 8
Professional Texts 9
Promising Practices 10
Media and Workshops 11
Policy & Professional Resources 12
Imprinted Products 12
Division Publications 13
Ordering Information 14
Index/Order Form 15-16

Revised Life Centered Career Education

Youth Suicide

Preparation for Special Education Hearings

20% Member Discount

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE COUNCIL FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION

IDENTIFICATION

THE COUNCIL FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

1920 Association Drive
Reston, Virginia 22091
Voice/TDD (703)620-3660
FAX (703)264-9494

CHAPTER # __________

(If chapter number is not known, please leave blank. CEC will inform you of your placement in the appropriate state or provincial group.)

Name ____
First ***(Please Print)*** *Initial* *Last*

Address ____
Street

____ (   )
City *State or Province* *Zip/Postal Code* *Phone* ☐ *work* ☐ *home*

Have you been a CEC member within the last year?
______ yes
______ no

CEC is authorized to make available, at an appropriate charge, the full or partial list of its members to certain carefully selected companies or organizations serving the fields of regular and special education. If you do not want your name included, please check this box: ☐

CATEGORY

U.S. States	Regular	Student*
GA, ME, TX	☐ 56.00	☐ 24.50
FL	☐ 56.50	☐ 24.00
DE, KS, NV, VT, WA	☐ 57.00	☐ 24.00
CT	☐ 57.00	☐ 24.50
MT, NC, PA, RI	☐ 58.00	☐ 24.00
MI	☐ 59.00	☐ 24.00
CO, IL, MN, NY, OH	☐ 60.00	☐ 24.00
SC, VA, WI, WY	☐ 60.00	☐ 24.00
CA	☐ 63.00	☐ 24.50
All other States	☐ 55.00	☐ 24.00
Canadian Provinces	☐ 55.00	☐ 24.00

***Student Discount Requirement.** To be eligible for student membership, your advisor must complete the following:

I certify that the above named person is a college or university student and is not engaged in full-time employment in the education profession.

Advisor's Signature ____________________

Name of School ____________________

Expected Graduation Date ____________________

Special Membership Categories. CEC has special discounts for husband/wife members and retired persons. If interested, check the appropriate box and return this form to CEC. Information on qualifications and dues will be mailed to you at the above address.

☐ Retired ☐ Husband/Wife

Did someone sponsor you as a member? If so, please record the person's name.

____

DIVISIONS

Only CEC members qualify for membership in CEC Divisions.

	Regular	*Student*
A. Division on the Physically Handicapped (DPH)	☐ 6.00	☐ 2.00
*B. Council of Administrators of Special Education (CASE)	☐ 40.00	☐ 20.00
C. Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders (CCBD)	☐ 17.00	☐ 9.00
D. Division on Mental Retardation (CEC-MR)	☐ 12.00	☐ 6.00
E. Division for Children with Communication Disorders (DCCD)	☐ 12.00	☐ 3.00
F. Division for Learning Disabilities (DLD)	☐ 15.00	☐ 8.00
G. Division for the Visually Handicapped (DVH)	☐ 10.00	☐ 5.00
H. The Association for the Gifted (TAG)	☐ 15.00	☐ 7.50
I. Teacher Education Division (TED)	☐ 15.00	☐ 5.00
J. Division for Early Childhood (DEC)	☐ 15.00	☐ 7.50
K. Council for Educational Diagnostic Services (CEDS)	☐ 15.00	☐ 7.00
L. Technology and Media Division (TAM)	☐ 10.00	☐ 10.00
M. Division on Career Development (DCD)	☐ 10.00	☐ 5.00
N. Division for Research (CEC-DR)	☐ 15.00	☐ 5.00
**P. CEC Pioneers Division (CEC-PD)	☐ 25.00	

CS90

*CASE membership is available to professional special education administrators, college faculty and post-masters students in administration of special education. (CEC Retired members are also eligible for CASE Student dues @ $20.00.) To join CASE, please complete the following:

Position Title: ____________________

Responsibilities: ____________________

____

**CEC-PD membership is available to Life, Retired or 20-year CEC members.

DUES

As a special education professional, your CEC membership may be tax deductible.

$ ________ + $ ________ + $ ________ = $ ________ U.S.

CEC Dues **Division Dues** ***Certificate (Optional—$2.00)** **TOTAL DUES**

*Regular, Husband/Wife, Retired, Life, and Retired Life members are eligible to receive an attractive personalized Certificate of Membership. Simply enter $2.00 above. Allow up to 8 weeks for delivery.

Payment is by ☐ Check (in U.S. Dollars) ☐ MasterCard ☐ VISA

____
Card No Bank No (MasterCard) Expiration Date

____
Signature Daytime Telephone Number

Please send this form and your payment to:

CEC
1920 Association Drive
Reston, VA 22091-1589

Postal Notice: Annual membership dues in CEC include $11.00 for subscription to *Exceptional Children* and $7.50 for *TEACHING Exceptional Children*. Annual membership dues in CCBD Division include $5.50 for subscription to *Behavioral Disorders*; annual membership dues in CEC-MR Division include $4.50 for subscription to *Education and Training in Mental Retardation*. Please do not use this as a basis for payment.

CEC Membership Information

The Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) is the only professional organization in the world dedicated to advancing the quality of education for all exceptional children and improving the conditions under which special educators work.

Founded in 1922, CEC has grown into an international network of more than 54,000 members, located primarily in the United States and Canada.

Members are teachers, administrators, teacher educators, students, support services professionals, researchers and parents. All enjoy the important benefits outlined below.

CEC PROFESSIONAL BENEFITS AND SERVICES

1. **Exceptional Children** mailed six times each year.
2. **TEACHING Exceptional Children** with UPDATE, two-time award winner, mailed four times each year.
3. Fifteen divisions of CEC on various areas of interest and exceptionality.
4. Information services through CEC and ERIC.
5. Access to technical assistance and training.
6. Books and multimedia products at 20% member discount.
7. Member discounts on all CEC and division conferences and conventions.
8. Invitations to the annual CEC Convention and other professional development activities sponsored by CEC and its divisions.
9. Group rates for worldwide travel.
10. Opportunity to receive major credit cards with no annual fee for the first year.
11. Group rates for special low-cost insurance programs including professional liability.
12. Effective representation at all levels of government. **Your membership gives power to your voice.**

CEC PROFESSIONAL DIVISIONS

CEC Divisions are special organizations which concentrate on a particular exceptionality of children or unique aspect of special education. Divisions publish journals and newsletters and hold conferences and workshops for members.

- **Division on the Physically Handicapped** (DPH)—*The DPH Journal* [3], Newsletter [4]
- **Council of Administrators of Special Education** (CASE)—*Case In Point* [3], Newsletter [5]
- **Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders** (CCBD)—*Behavioral Disorders* [4], Newsletter [4]
- **Division on Mental Retardation** (CEC-MR)—*Education and Training in Mental Retardation* [4], Newsletter [2]
- **Division for Children with Communication Disorders** (DCCD)—*Journal of Childhood Communication Disorders* [2], Newsletter [2]
- **Division for Learning Disabilities** (DLD)—Two Journals— *Learning Disabilities Focus* [2] and *Learning Disabilities Research* [2], Newsletter [3]
- **Division for the Visually Handicapped** (DVH)—Newsletter [4]
- **The Association for the Gifted** (TAG)—*Journal for the Education of the Gifted* [4], Newsletter [5]
- **Teacher Education Division** (TED)—*Teacher Education and Special Education* [4], Newsletter [3]
- **Division for Early Childhood** (DEC)—*Journal of Early Intervention* [4], Newsletter [4]
- **Council for Educational Diagnostic Services** (CEDS)—*Diagnostique* [4], Newsletter [4]
- **Technology and Media Division** (TAM)—*Journal of Special Education Technology* [4], Newsletter [3]
- **Division on Career Development** (DCD)—*Career Development for Exceptional Individuals* [2], Newsletter [4]
- **Division for Research** (CEC-DR)—*Exceptionality* [2], *Research Monograph* [1], Newsletter [4]
- **CEC Pioneers Division** (CEC-PD)—Newsletter [4]

Only CEC members are eligible for membership in CEC Professional Divisions.

Subscribe to CEC's Journals

Exceptional Children

Research you can depend on.

Published six times a year, *Exceptional Children* helps update your knowledge, while keeping you in touch with all aspects of academic inquiry taking place on topics of central concern to the profession.

Subscription $35.00; foreign $39.50; single copy $7.00.

TEACHING Exceptional Children

Ideas to enhance learning.

With each of the four annual issues, you learn about new instructional strategies, innovative curricular approaches, and reliable assessment procedures that reflect the blending of theory into practice.

Subscription $20.00; foreign $23.00; single copy $7.00.

Professional Development

Richness Through Diversity

Multicultural Symposia
October 18–20, 1990
Albuquerque, New Mexico

An increasing awareness of multicultural issues and of the needs of culturally diverse exceptional children has accelerated the need for responsive instruction and programs. Plan to participate in this 2½ day exploration of crucial issues and emerging trends.

ACADEMY

Effective Instruction for Mildly Handicapped Students: An Academy for Teacher Educators

Dr. Anita Archer
Dr. Stephen Isaacson
San Diego State University
June 18–23, 1990

CEC's Academy for Effective Instruction program includes training for college and university staff. The solid research base of the Academies and deliberate link established between theory and practice makes this training ideal for translating the research on effective instruction into practical, workable techniques for classroom use.

This 6-day event focuses on critical presentation skills, structuring lessons, and teaching strategies, rules, and concepts. Completion of training entitles participants to access to Academy materials for use with their own students.

UPCOMING TRAINING

Academy for Professional Collaboration Skills

(Available after May 1, 1990)

This new Academy addresses one of the most significant concerns faced by educators in the '90s. It will define collaboration, demonstrate collaborative approaches, identify barriers, provide skill training in a variety of collaborative skills, and encourage team-building.

Academy for Life Centered Career Education

(Available after August 1, 1990)

More than occupational education, LCCE facilitates growth for all life roles, settings, and events. It is a comprehensive approach which builds specific desired student competencies in daily living skills, personal-social skills, and occupational guidance and preparation—all supported by appropriate academics. LCCE is carried across curriculum and across grade levels K–12+.

ACADEMY

Academy for Exceptional Bilingual Students Multisystem: Systematic Instructional Planning

Multisystem is a comprehensive training package designed for a diverse constituency of professionals who serve culturally and linguistically diverse exceptional (CLDE) students. Developed at the Institute for Urban and Minority Education at Columbia University, Multisystem encompasses four distinct formats:

Introductory overview
In-depth training in specific content areas
The entire 45-hour Multisystem package
Preparation of trainers

The cornerstone modules include: (1) specialized informal assessment, (2) culturally and linguistically appropriate programming, (3) language minority parent involvement strategies, and (4) provision of school-based support/consulting.

Organizations may contract with CEC for Multisystem on-site training.

ACADEMY

for Effective Instruction Working with Mildly Handicapped Students

School districts may contract directly with CEC to provide on-site training (1–3 days) for their teachers and supervisors. Short overview courses (3–5 hours) meet a district's inservice requirements or the preconference training format of federation/division meetings.

School districts can select from the following topics:

- Design and Delivery of Academic Lessons
- Teaching Strategies
- Teaching Rules
- Teaching Concepts
- Teaching Reading Comprehension
- Effective Leadership for Supervisors
- Behaviorally Anchored Supervision System
- Computers and Effective Mathematics Instruction
- Computers and Effective Writing Instruction
- Computers and Effective Science/Social Studies Instruction

Take advantage of these exceptional opportunities! For conference/convention information, call Dao Tran at 703/264-9450; for information about training offerings, contact Wilda Skroch in the Department of Professional Development, The Council for Exceptional Children, 1920 Association Drive, Reston, VA 22091 (703/264-9447).

Future Conventions

CEC's 69th Annual Convention,
Atlanta, Georgia, April 1–5, 1991
CEC's 70th Annual Convention,
Baltimore, Maryland, April 13–17, 1992

CEC's 71st Annual Convention,
San Antonio, Texas, April 5–9, 1993
CEC's 72nd Annual Convention,
Denver, Colorado, April 4–8, 1994

Information Services

CEC and Its Projects Provide a Continuum of Information Services:

Digests, Research Briefs, and Minibibliographies are two-page flyers designed to provide general information on specific topics, practices, and research. These materials are in the public domain and may be freely reproduced for dissemination. Approximately 75 titles available. $1.00 each (U.S. funds), minimum order $5.00. Write to CEC/ERIC Information Services and request our latest Product Flyer.

Infopackets are compendiums of digests and briefs clustered around specific topics or targeted for selected audiences. $12.50 each; CEC Member price $10.00. Current offerings:

E101	Handicapped and At-Risk Children (15 digests)
E102	Teaching Students Who Have Handicaps (18 digests)
E103	Administration and Supervision in Special Education (17 digests)

(Order form on back cover.)

Directories are bibliographies of ongoing research funded by the Office of Special Education Programs, U.S. Department of Education. Currently 15 directories are available. $7.50 each. Request Product Flyer for Directory Topics.

Computer Search Reprints are collections of carefully selected abstracts on topics of current interest. Each contains abstracts from both the ERIC and ECER databases. The average reprint includes 100 citations. Computer search reprints are printed in limited quantities and updated frequently. $16.00; CEC Member Price $12.80. Current titles are listed on the back page of this catalog.

Super Search Reprints include up to 150 abstracts plus introductory material highlighting major issues or practices on the topic. $22.50; CEC Member Price $18.00.

ERIC Minisearches offer the user an abbreviated customized search of the ERIC database on CD-ROM that includes abstracts of both RIE and CIJE documents. This is a new service designed to help users do a preliminary search on topics of interest. This strategy is especially suitable for emerging topics or in areas where few resources are known to exist. A printout of up to 10 citations with abstracts or up to 25 references without abstracts will be provided. $15.00; CEC Member Price $12.00.

Custom Computer Searches are complete online searches of the ERIC and/or ECER database(s) customized to meet specific user needs.
One Database (ECER or ERIC) $45.00 (up to 50 abstracts)
Two Databases (ECER and ERIC) $62.50 (up to 100 abstracts)

Special CEC Member Rates:
One Database (ECER or ERIC) $35.00 (up to 50 abstracts)
Two Databases (ECER and ERIC) $50.00 (up to 100 abstracts)
Additional abstracts at $7.50 per 25 abstracts
To initiate a search, call ERIC/CEC at 703/620-3660 and ask for an Information Specialist.

ECER Database and Abstract Journal. CEC produces the Exceptional Child Education Resources (ECER) database, which contains more than 70,000 abstracts of published literature in special education covering the education and development of disabled and gifted individuals. CEC's quarterly abstract journal, *Exceptional Child Education Resources*, provides abstracts and indexes of the most recent additions to the ECER database. ECER's unique contribution is the inclusion of books, dissertations, and selected journal articles not included in the ERIC collection. Like ERIC, the ECER database is available online through the BRS and Dialog search services.

Exceptional Child Education Resources (US ISSN 0160-4309). Contains citations of the special education publications and documents that have been added to the ECER database. Each citation is subject-indexed and gives bibliographical availability data and an abstractor annotation. Indexes cumulate annually by author, title, subject. Published quarterly in May, August, November, February. All subscriptions begin with the May issue. Institutional subscription $75.00, foreign $80.00. Supplementary (to be shipped to main institutional address) $35.00 each. CEC Member Price, $60.00. Single copy $20.00.

CEC's Special Projects

ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children collects and abstracts special education documents for the ERIC database which contains over 700,000 items. The Clearinghouse provides database searches, printed literature, and referral assistance to agencies and individuals needing information on children with handicaps or gifted learners. For information on fees and services call 703/264-9474.

The National Clearinghouse for Professions in Special Education distributes information to attract individuals to a career in special education and related services. The clearinghouse is also involved in providing information on accreditation standards, personnel preparation programs, and personnel supply and demand. 703/264-9475.

Center for Special Education Technology provides information about technology and its use in special education. The Center has developed a series of state and topical resource inventories available upon request. 1-800-873-8255.

AIDS Education: Interdisciplinary, Multicultural Approaches for Students and Teachers provides information about AIDS education curricula potentially suitable for use with handicapped children. 703/264-9451.

266

Early Childhood

No. P325 Early Childhood Special Education: Birth to Three

June B. Jordan, James J. Gallagher, Patricia L. Hutinger, and Merle B. Karnes, Editors

The challenge of providing services to handicapped children from birth to 3 years of age is addressed by this monumental work of unprecedented scope. Because the mandate, set forth in P.L. 99–457, requires the participation of so many disciplines, service delivery models are not in place. This volume represents a comprehensive effort of well-qualified professionals to describe the nature of the new territory.

Chapter Highlights:
- Administrative Challenges in Early Intervention
- Model Programs for Infants and Toddlers with Handicaps
- Linking Screening, Identification, and Assessment with Curriculum
- Parent Involvement in Early Childhood Special Education
- Early Intervention Team Approaches: The Transdisciplinary Model
- Staffing Patterns and Team Models in Infancy Programs
- Defining the Infancy Specialization in Early Childhood Special Education
- Program Evaluation: The Key to Quality Programming
- Early Intervention Public Policy: Past, Present, and Future
- Preparing for the Change: The Implementation of Public Law 99–457

1988. 257pp. ISBN 0–86586–179–X. CEC/ERIC
$27.00; **CEC Member Price, $21.60**

Computer Search Reprints

$16.00; **CEC Member Price, $12.80**

No. C522	Research on the Effectiveness of Early Childhood Education for Handicapped Children 7/88
No. C539	Programs for Handicapped/High-Risk Infants 1/89
No. C563	Preschool Programs for Handicapped Children 6/89

Culturally Diverse/Bilingual

No. R620 Exceptional Asian Children and Youth

Margie K. Kitano and Philip C. Chinn, Editors
1986. 69pp. ISBN 0–86586–165–X. CEC/ERIC
$10.00; **CEC Member Price, $8.00**

No. R292 Education of Culturally and Linguistically Different Exceptional Children

Philip C. Chinn, Editor
1984. 123pp. ISBN 0–86586–152–8. CEC/ERIC
$10.00; **CEC Member Price, $8.00**

No. R259 Assessment, Placement, and Programming of Bilingual Exceptional Pupils: A Practical Approach

Maximino Plata
1982. 54pp. ISBN 0–86586–136–6. CEC/ERIC
$8.00; **CEC Member Price, $6.40**

No. R621 Educational Services to Handicapped Students with Limited English Proficiency: A California State-Wide Study

Patricia T. Cegelka, Rena Lewis, Ana Maria Rodriguez, and Richard Pacheco, Editors
1986. 122pp. ISBN 0–86586–166–8. CEC/ERIC
$10.00; **CEC Member Price, $8.00**

No. P624 American Indian Exceptional Children and Youth

Marilyn J. Johnson and Bruce A. Ramirez, Editors
1987. 70pp. ISBN 0–86586–152–8. CEC/ERIC
$8.50; **CEC Member Price, $6.80**

NEW

No. B711 Meeting the Multicultural Needs of the Hispanic Students in Special Education

Richard A. Figueroa, Sandra H. Fradd, and Vivian I. Correa, Guest Editors

This special topical issue of *Exceptional Children* covers such diverse topics as assessment, language differences, optimal learning environments, and advocacy.

1989. 96pp. *Exceptional Children*, Vol. 56, No. 2. $7.00

No. P326 Schools and the Culturally Diverse Exceptional Student: Promising Practices and Future Directions

Bruce Ramirez and Alba A. Ortiz, Editors

Strategies for working effectively with the increasing numbers of multicultural students with handicaps are addressed in this collection of outstanding presentations. Highlights:
- Assessment and Characteristics of Hispanic Students Who Are Learning Disabled, Speech Language Handicapped, Mentally Retarded, Behavior Disordered
- Preventing Inappropriate Referrals
- Commonalities and Diversities Among Asian Americans
- Finding and Nurturing Potential Giftedness

1988. 143pp. ISBN 0–86586–182–X. CEC/ERIC
$18.00; **CEC Member Price, $14.40**

Computer Search Reprints

$16.00; **CEC Member Price, $12.80**

No. C555	Culturally Diverse Gifted Students 2/87
No. C568	Identification and Assessment of Exceptional Bilingual Students 5/88
No. C577	Teaching Black Students Who Have Handicaps 9/89

Career Education

No. P321 Job Success for Handicapped Youth: A Social Protocol Curriculum

Joseph J. Stowitschek
and Charles L. Salzberg

Research indicates that it is not lack of skill that prevents handicapped workers from competing successfully in the work place. Rather, it is inappropriate social behavior that prevents workers from keeping their jobs. This research-based curriculum will help build the necessary social skills for job success.

This model of teaching social skills incorporates three dimensions essential to successful intervention. These are: conducting ecological analysis of key social skills, identifying the functional effects of these skills across a variety of employment settings, and facilitating generalization.

The curriculum includes actual lessons to use in school and on the job. The appendix provides forms that can be duplicated for assessing social skills, interviewing employers, and observing the worker on the job.

1987. 62pp. ISBN 0–86586–172–2. CEC/ERIC

$12.50; **CEC Member Price, $10.00**

Life Centered Career Education: Activity Books I and II

Lynn Miller, Lynda Glascoe, and Charles J. Kokaska

These two activity books add to the Life Centered Curriculum by providing special activities to be used with students at the elementary and secondary levels. The material provided in Activity Books One and Two gives students practice with academic skills in practical contexts. Although Book Two is specifically designed for the adolescent or older student, many of the activities in Book One may need to be practiced by these students as well. It is suggested that teachers refer to both books before selecting the activity that best meets the needs of their unique group of students.

The Life Centered Career Education competencies were originally designed for instruction with mildly mentally retarded secondary students. This approach, however, has been used in regular classrooms and with other types of exceptional learners at both elementary and middle school levels.

No. P303 Activity Book I (Elementary Level)

ISBN 0–86586–162–5

No. P304 Activity Book II (Secondary Level)

ISBN 0–86586–163–3

1986. 96pp. each. CEC/ERIC

$12.50; **CEC Member Price, $10.00 each**

No. B707 Transition from School to Adult Life

Gary M. Clark and H. Earle Knowlton, Guest Editors

This special issue of *Exceptional Children* documents the progress in the transition movement. It provides a combination of historical perspective with current reports on research and programs.

1987. 96pp. *Exceptional Children*, Vol. 53, No. 6. $7.00

NEW EDITION

No. P180R Life Centered Career Education: A Competency Based Approach—Third Edition

Donn E. Brolin, Editor

Originally published in 1978, the Life Centered Curriculum has been among CEC's top sellers for over 10 years and continues to gain growing adoption in a large number of school districts across the country. This publication contains 97 subcompetency units and some specific examples of how Life Centered Career Education (LCCE) can be taught, although it is not intended to present everything you need to know about teaching students. Rather, this curriculum guide provides a framework for building a comprehensive and systematic effort for career development which can be infused into academic subjects and/or provided as separate units.

In addition to the subcompetency units, this guide can be used for the development of an individualized education program and for student assessment. The Competency Rating Scale presented in this publication can be used to track the progress of each student's competency development on a yearly or semester basis.

Revised 1989. 179pp. ISBN 0–86586–186–2.

$19.50; **CEC Member Price, $15.60**

NEW EDITION

No. M181R Life Centered Career Education: Trainer's Manual

Robert J. Loyd and Donn E. Brolin

An extensively revised and expanded Trainer's Manual will soon be available for school districts wishing to implement LCCE on a broad scale basis. The manual provides approximately 30-1/2 hours of inservice training and includes masters for participants' handouts, transparencies, and support text for the trainer. Also in the package is a 30-minute video cassette that presents an overview and discussion of the LCCE approach. The video is used in one of the workshops but it is also useful to show to administrators, school boards, parents, and community groups. The material is packaged in an easy to use loose-leaf binder. It contains sections on Planning for Staff Development, Implementing Staff Development, and LCCE Curriculum Planning and Evaluation. Sample planning documents, letters of agreement, and evaluation instruments are provided.

Revised 1989. 305pp. ISBN 0–86586–187–0.

$150.00; **CEC Member Price, $120.00**

No. M181V Life Centered Career Education Videotape

This 30 minute VHS videotape presents a discussion among Donn Brolin, Kenneth Hoyt, and two special educators experienced in the implementation of the LCCE approach. The tape is part of M181R, the LCCE Trainer's Manual package. It is also being offered separately, however, for those who wish to use it as an introduction to the LCCE concept.

30 Minute VHS

$62.50; **CEC Member Price, $50.00**

Gifted and Talented

NEW

No. E105 Flyer File on Gifted Students

This is an outstanding collection of all new digests, minibibliographies, and reprints covering such topics as: discovering mathematical talent, highly gifted, summer experiences, computers, stress management, mentors, language minority, advocacy, and young gifted children. The collection includes 23 two- to four-page flyers to duplicate and use as handouts for practitioners and parents. The materials are highly practical and readable. The file is packaged in a file folder for easy storage in your file cabinet.

1990. 23 Flyers. CEC/ERIC.

$22.50. **CEC Member Price $18.00**

NEW

No. R631 Standards for Programs Involving the Gifted and Talented

These standards, developed with the assistance of hundreds of professionals involved in the field of gifted child education, describe minimum characteristics that should be found in all programs for able learners. Contents: Assessment for Identification; Program Design; Curriculum Design; Professional Development. A joint publication of The Association for the Gifted and CEC/ERIC.

1989. 16pp. $6.25; **CEC Member Price, $5.00**

No. P328 Flexible Pacing for Able Learners

Neil Daniel and June Cox

Flexible pacing is any provision that places students at an appropriate instructional level, creating the best possible match between students' achievement and instruction, and allows them to move forward in the curriculum as they achieve mastery of content and skills. For able learners flexible pacing will generally result in some form of acceleration, accomplished either by moving students up to advanced content or by moving advanced content down to the students. In practice, flexible pacing can be achieved by a variety of methods including

- Continuous Progress.
- Compacted Course.
- Advanced Level Course.
- Grade Skipping.
- Early Entrance.
- Concurrent or Dual Enrollment.
- Credit by Examination.

This book describes the workable options appropriate for elementary, secondary, and all grade levels. Actual examples illustrate how flexible pacing works in classrooms with real students across the country.

1988. 119pp. ISBN 0–86586–183–8. CEC/ERIC

$12.50; **CEC Member Price, $10.00**

No. P273 The Underserved: Our Young Gifted Children

Merle B. Karnes, Editor

A publication for teachers and parents who want to be able to recognize potentially gifted children and follow through with appropriate action. Throughout the publication an effort has been made to include both theory and practice. The most effective models are presented as well as the competencies needed by teachers to help these special youngsters develop their abilities.

1983. 228pp. ISBN 0–86586–147–1. CEC/ERIC

$20.00; **CEC Member Price, $16.00**

No. P330 College Planning for Gifted Students

Sandra L. Berger

College Planning for Gifted Students describes in detail how to create a 6-year plan that guides the gifted student through critical decision-making choices based on personal goals, values, and learning style.

Based on research, extensive telephone interviews with dozens of key educators, and personal experience, the author has distilled the essence of what has to be done to create the best match between student and educational experience.

Characteristics of gifted learners are clearly laid out in a new conceptual matrix that offers useful perspectives on the dynamics of how gifted students think and behave. Special characteristics of the preadolescent, culturally different, female, underachieving, and learning disabled student are identified. Specific suggestions are provided for working with these students' special needs.

It is the premise of this book that college planning is a matter of finding a good match between student and college. First the student must learn about himself or herself. Berger provides a wealth of information about resources and techniques to do this. Then the student must learn about colleges. Here too, she shows where to look and what to ask to get the kinds of answers that will be of most use. Finally, we are taken through the application process itself.

Wherever appropriate, Berger includes suggestions on what counselors can do, what parents can do, and what teachers can do.

1989. 150pp. ISBN 0–86586–184–6. CEC/ERIC

$18.50; **CEC Member Price, $14.80**

REVISED

No. P268 A Practical Guide to Counseling the Gifted in a School Setting, Second Edition

Joyce VanTassel-Baska, Editor

Find out why counseling is an indispensable component to your gifted and talented program. This revised edition provides twice as much information about how to counsel gifted youngsters in your school. New chapters deal with recent trends and issues in counseling the gifted; collaboration of teachers and counselors in serving affective needs of gifted students; the writing, reading, counseling connection; plus a small group counseling unit for gifted elementary students.

1990. 102pp. ISBN 0–86586–146–3. CEC/ERIC

$12.50; **CEC Member Price, $10.00**

Computer Search Reprints

$16.00; **CEC Member Price, $12.80**

No. C538	Gifted Female Students 6/87
No. C544	Identification of the Gifted 6/88
No. C553	Gifted and Learning Disabled 11/89
No. C554	Creativity Programs and Practices 2/87
No. C555	Culturally Diverse Gifted Students 2/87
No. C559	Research on Effectiveness of Gifted Education 6/89
No. C562	Preschool Gifted Children 1/88
No. C565	Underachieving Gifted Students 7/89
No. C569	Teaching Gifted Elementary School Children 6/88
No. C578	Programs for Secondary Gifted Students 8/89

Professional Texts and References

No. S329 Understanding and Conducting Qualitative Research

Susan Stainback and William Stainback

Do not plan your next research study without this reference. Be sure to include this resource for all research method courses.

- Clarifies when to use qualitative research.
- Describes how to structure the research study.
- Provides guidelines for how to collect, organize, and analyze data.
- Examines issues of validity, reliability, and generalizability.
- Provides examples from real studies.

1988. 120pp. ISBN 0-8403-5020-1.

$19.50; **CEC Member Price, $15.60**

No. P306 Alternative Futures in Special Education

James J. Gallagher and Bluma B. Weiner, Editors

This professional text analyzes what has been learned in critical areas of special education research and effective practices and lays out the agenda for the future. Topics include: legislative advocacy, public policy, families, research in deafness, prevention of birth defects, proposed Academy of Scholars, leadership training models, and technology.

1986. 204pp. ISBN 0-86586-160-9. CEC/ERIC

$21.25; **CEC Member Price, $17.00**

No. P260 Attitudes and Attitude Change in Special Education: Theory and Practice

Reginald L. Jones, Editor

The definitive text in the area of attitude and attitude change research toward the handicapped.

Never before has this literature been brought together in one document. This text not only describes research outcomes, it presents appropriate methodology for doing attitudinal research.

1984. 257pp. ISBN 0-86586-137-4. CEC/ERIC

$22.95; **CEC Member Price, $18.35**

No. P258 Reflections on Growing Up Disabled

Reginald L. Jones, Editor

A unique sharing of the childhood feelings, insights, and self-perceptions of disabled people. Frustrations related to learning and socialization are expressed. An invaluable aid in gaining insight into the problems, fears, and triumphs of handicapped students.

1983. 112pp. ISBN 0-86586-134-X. CEC/ERIC

$12.50; **CEC Member Price, $10.00**

No. R315 A Special Educator's Perspective on Interfacing Special and General Education: A Review for Administrators

David E. Greenburg

Promotes the concept of "shared responsibility" among regular and special educators. The document examines the current models used in mainstreaming and suggests ways teachers, administrators, and other service providers can move toward a single system for managing educational resources on behalf of all students.

1987. 20pp. ISBN 0-86586-167-6. CEC/ERIC

$6.40; **CEC Member Price, $5.10**

NEW

No. P331 Youth Suicide—What the Educator Should Know

Eleanor C. Guetzloe

Much has been done in the public media to help heighten awareness about the signs of impending suicide attempts. This book, however, is written especially for educators. It tells what the school can do, including the components of an effective prevention program. Guetzloe urges schools to consider the special education model in developing appropriate interventions for these special students.

The book will help teachers, principals, and counselors become more alert to the danger signs and adolescent crises that may trigger suicide. It will help educators assess suicide potential and suggest appropriate communication procedures.

This valuable reference book belongs in every school building. Principals need to make this resource available to every person who works with young people today.

Parent organizations and school boards will also want to review this material.

1989. 208pp. ISBN 0-86586-188-9. CEC/ERIC

$18.50; **CEC Member Price, $14.80**

No. S320 Research in Learning Disabilities: Issues and Future Directions

Sharon Vaughn and Candace Bos, Editors

Derived from a symposium sponsored by the CEC Division for Learning Disabilities in February 1986, this publication focuses on the emerging issues surrounding learning disabilities. Included are papers on Models and Theories, Research, Eligibility, Assessment, Intervention, and Public Policy. Appropriate for use as a college text in courses dealing with learning disabilities and a resource for all learning disabilities professionals.

1987. 276pp. ISBN 0-316-10305-5.

$30.00; **CEC Member Price, $24.00**

No. P300 The School Psychologist and the Exceptional Child

Geraldine T. Scholl, Editor

A text designed specifically to provide school psychologists in training with practical information about the characteristics and needs of various types of exceptional children in relation to the assessment process. Practicing school psychologists will find it an invaluable, up-to-date resource when working with low-incidence exceptionalities.

1985. 256pp. ISBN 0-86586-153-6. CEC/ERIC

$21.75; **CEC Member Price, $17.40**

Computer Search Reprints

$16.00; **CEC Member Price, $12.80**

No. C521	Research on the Effectiveness of Mainstreaming 8/88
No. C542	Brain Research: Implications for the Education of Exceptional Children 4/89
No. C545	International Trends in Special Education 6/88
No. C550	Changing Attitudes Toward the Handicapped 6/88
No. C557	Future Trends in Special Education 1/89

Examination copy for inservice or preservice course adoption consideration can be sent on 60-day approval.

Promising Practices

No. P293 Integration of Students with Severe Handicaps into Regular Schools

Susan Stainback and William Stainback

The purpose of this text is to show how the support and cooperation of both regular and special class teachers can give students with severe handicaps the opportunity to become integral members of regular schools.

- Describes methods for assessing knowledge, attitudes, and behavior of nonhandicapped students and provides a training model about individual differences.
- Provides strategies for assessing and teaching social interaction skills to students with severe handicaps.
- Describes strategies used in successful integration programs throughout the nation.

1985. 145pp. ISBN 0–86586–151–X. CEC/ERIC
$18.00; **CEC Member Price, $14.45**

No. P322 Secondary Special Education: A Guide to Promising Public School Programs

Cynthia L. Warger and Bluma B. Weiner, Editors

This book is written for administrators, directors, and other special education personnel who are responsible for design and implementation of service delivery to secondary youth. The majority of the book describes actual programs including Resource Room options, Vocational Programs, and Special Schools and Centers.

1987. 185pp. ISBN 0–86586–176–5. CEC/ERIC
$20.00; **CEC Member Price, $16.00**

No. P305 Teaching Learning Disabled Students at the Secondary School Level

Naomi Zigmond, Jan Sansone, Sandra E. Miller, Kathleen A. Donahoe, and Rachel Kohnke

This new addition to the series *What Research and Experience Say to the Teacher of Exceptional Children* provides practical suggestions for structuring and implementing programs that work. Topics include: Selecting a model; planning for instruction; organizing instruction to maximize student learning; beyond direct services; recommendations for teachers.

1986. 50pp. ISBN 0–86586–161–7. CEC/ERIC
$10.00; **CEC Member Price, $8.00**

No. P200 Understanding Child Variance

William C. Morse and Judith M. Smith

For use either as a text with the video training workshops or for independent study. Contains six self-instructional modules. Each unit includes a pretest/posttest that allows students to monitor learning gains. The focus is on concepts that influence a teacher's approach to classroom management and on interventions based on each position. Extensive bibliographies are included.

1980. 117pp. ISBN 0–86586–099–8.
$16.00; **CEC Member Price, $12.80**

No. B703 Curriculum-Based Assessment

James A. Tucker, Guest Editor

This special issue of *Exceptional Children* examines all aspects of curriculum-based assessment as it relates to the education of exceptional children.

1985. 96pp. *Exceptional Children*, Vol. 52, No. 3. $7.00

NEW

No. P333 Beyond Drill and Practice: Expanding the Computer Mainstream

Susan Jo Russell, Rebecca Corwin, Janice R. Mokros, and Peggy M. Kapisovsky

Obtain the best practices in the use of technology for children with handicaps and slow learners. Teachers can move *beyond drill and practice* with students by putting these research-based strategies to work in their classrooms. The focus is on learner-centered software that encourages skill development and understanding of subject matter. These authors have written an informative, easy-to-read text which will be of interest to many classroom teachers who are looking for new ways to use computers in the integration of special education students.

1989. 120pp. ISBN 0–86586–190–0.
$18.00; **CEC Member Price, $14.40**

No. B709 Students at Risk

A Special issue of *TEACHING Exceptional Children*

Provides practical approaches for working with students identified "At Risk." Includes articles on youth suicide, medically fragile children, youngsters with chemical dependencies, infants, migrant and rural exceptional children, and certain gifted and talented children.

1988. 96pp. *TEACHING Exceptional Children*, Vol. 20, No. 4. $7.00

Computer Search Reprints

$16.00; **CEC Member Price, $12.80**

No. C527	Severely Handicapped Students: Curriculum Guides and Teaching Methods 8/88
No. C543	Facilitating Mainstreaming: Guidelines for Teachers and Principals 4/89
No. C546	Learning Disabilities: Definitions, Assessment, and Eligibility Criteria 8/89
No. C548	Cognitive Strategies for the Mildly Handicapped 8/89
No. C552	Attention Deficit Disorders and Hyperactivity 1/89
No. C560	Instructional Technology for the Mildly Handicapped 11/87
No. C564	Educating Emotionally Disturbed Children and Youth 3/88
No. C566	Teaching Learning Disabled Elementary School Children 4/88
No. C567	Teaching Learning Disabled Adolescents 4/88

NEW

Super Search Reprints

Up to 150 abstracts—Plus introductory document

$22.50; **CEC Member Price, $18.00**

No. C571	Serious Emotional Disturbance and Social Maladjustment 1/90
No. C572	Preventive Discipline and Behavior Management 8/89
No. C573	Adapted Physical Education 12/89
No. C574	Prereferral Intervention for Students with Learning and Behavior Problems 12/89
No. C575	Peer Support and Cooperative Learning for Accommodating Student Variance 12/89
No. C576	Curriculum Based Assessment and Curriculum Based Measurement 1/90

Media and Workshops

NEW

Audio Tapes

Find out what experts are thinking and saying about Alternative Views of Special Education in this new audio cassette series. Recorded live at the 1989 CEC Preconvention Training Program in San Francisco, the tapes make it possible to share in the learning experienced by over 700 of your colleagues who attended. Hear the following presentations in your own home, car, or office:

No. M10 Four Paradigms of Social Scientific Thought: Multiple Views of Special Education and Disability. *Presenter:* Tom Skrtic
No. M11 Special Education and Disability from a Functionalist View. *Presenter:* Tom Skrtic
No. M12 Special Education and Disability from a Structuralist View. *Presenter:* Sally Tomlinson
No. M13 Special Education and Disability from an Interpretivist View. *Presenters:* Diane and Philip Ferguson
No. M14 Special Education and Disability from a Humanist View. *Presenter:* Dwight Kiel
No. M15 Using the Radical Structuralist Paradigm to Examine the Creation and Use of Learning Disabilities. *Presenter:* Christine Sleeter
No. M16 Holism or: There Is No Substitute for Real Life Purposes and Processes. *Presenter:* Lous Heshusius
No. M17 Toward a Metatheory of School Organization and Adaptability: Special Education and Disability as Organizational Pathologies. *Presenter:* Tom Skrtic

$13.00 each; **CEC Member Price, $10.40**

Special Package

No. M21 Alternative Views and Theoretical Applications in Special Education. (Package of eight audio tapes M10–M17)

$85.00; **CEC Member Price, $68.00**

Other Audiotapes on Evolving Practices in Special Education

No. M18 Managing Change and Team Building. *Presenter:* Alan Coulter
No. M19 Accommodating for Greater Student Variance in Local Schools. *Presenters:* Richard Villa and Jacqueline Thousand
No. M20 Effective Supervision. *Presenter:* Stevan Kukic

$13.00 each; **CEC Member Price, $10.40**

No. M324 Teaching Mildly Handicapped Students: Video Training in Effective Instruction

Anita Archer, Abby Adams, Ed Ellis, Steve Isaacson, Mada Kay Morehead, and Ellen Peters Schiller

- Teaching Mildly Handicapped Students in the Elementary School
- Teaching Mildly Handicapped Students in the Secondary School

CEC's Academy for Effective Instruction has created a series of two videocassettes that illustrate how effective teaching principles can be applied to elementary and secondary school classroom situations. Teachers demonstrate delivery of complete lessons while showing examples of modeling, eliciting frequent and varied responses, and checking for comprehension. A total of 10 sequences of actual classroom instruction are included. The videotaped sequences can be used in pre- and inservice training sessions to show effective instruction implemented in the classrooms of mildly handicapped students. Package contains two videotapes, one for elementary teachers, one for secondary teachers and a teacher's guide for each tape with duplicate handouts for lectures and activities.

1987. VHS Format. Approx. 20 minutes each. Color.
ISBN 0–86586–180–3.
No. M324 Two tape package, VHS Format

$180.50; **CEC Member Price, $144.50**

Single cassettes include Teacher's Guide
M324E Teaching Mildly Handicapped Students in the Elementary School: Video Training in Effective Instruction.
Anita Archer, Steve Isaacson, Ellen Peters Schiller
M324S Teaching Mildly Handicapped Students in Secondary School: Video Training in Effective Instruction.
Anita Archer, Abby Adams, Ed Ellis, and Mada Kay Morehead

$95.50 each; **CEC Member Price, $76.50**

No. M199G Video Training Workshops on Child Variance (VHS)

William C. Morse and Judith M. Smith

A series of six videocassettes on which 15 variant behavior sequences from classroom situations are demonstrated and discussed by experts. The workshop includes all necessary materials to conduct five training sessions. *Understanding Child Variance*, a 117-page student-use text and a Workshop Leader's Manual with duplicable activity sheets are part of the package. (Tapes and student text may be purchased separately.)

1980. VHS Format. Approx. 30 minutes each. Color.
No. 199G VHS format

$690.00; **CEC Member Price, $552.00**

Single cassettes include Leader's Manual and student text.

M199h	Psychodynamic vs. Behavioral
M199i	Biophysical vs. Behavioral
M199j	Sociological vs. Psychodynamic
M199k	Ecological vs. Behavioral
M199l	Traditional vs. Alternative
M199m	15 Behavior Sequences

$132.80 each; **CEC Member Price, $106.25**

No. M317 P.L. 99-457—The Next Step Forward for Handicapped Children

Joseph Ballard, Frederick J. Weintraub, and Kathy Zantal-Wiener

A video training program has been developed by The Council for Exceptional Children to help educators, advocates, and social service agency workers learn about the federal legislation passed in October 1986. These materials describe how services for handicapped children from birth through age 5 have been strengthened and how interagency support will help enhance service delivery.

This media package is most helpful in providing an overview to professionals responsible for implementing the programs. It is designed for inservice training in schools and social service agencies.

The package contains: 23-minute VHS cassette, masters for 21 overhead transparencies, copies of the *Act* and the *Report*, 4 fact sheets, and a User's Guide.

1987. ISBN 0–86586–181–1.

$156.25; **CEC Member Price, $125.00**

Policy and Professional Resources

NEW

No. P327 Preparation for Special Education Hearings: A Practical Guide to Lessening the Trauma of Due Process Hearings

Richard E. Ekstrand, Patricia Edmister, Jane Riggin
One of the fundamental rights guaranteed under the Education of the Handicapped Act (EHA) is the right to an impartial due process hearing. Hearings are often difficult and emotionally draining experiences. They need not be so difficult, however, because proper and sensitive preparation for a hearing can minimize its negative emotional impact. This monograph presents fundamental information about the hearing process followed by a practical step-by-step guide to help school system personnel prepare for due process hearings and their aftermath.

1989. 48pp. ISBN 0–86586–189–7. CEC/ERIC
$10.00; **CEC Member Price, $8.00**

No. P196 P.L. 94-142, Section 504, and P.L. 99-457—Understanding What They Are and Are Not

Over 9,000 copies distributed since January 1987 revision!

Joseph Ballard, Bruce Ramirez, and Kathy Zantal-Wiener
This revised question-and-answer document reflects the latest changes in legislation affecting the education of handicapped children. This 16-page booklet answers questions about rights and protections, fiscal policy, management, preschool, early intervention, and other provisions of P.L. 99-457.

1987. 16pp. ISBN 0–86586–097–1.
1–9 copies $5.50 each; 10–49 copies $3.00 each; 50 or more $2.00

No. R628 Standards and Guidelines for Curriculum Excellence in Personnel Preparation Programs in Special Education

Department of Governmental Relations
Includes graduate and undergraduate guidelines for personnel preparation in special education. These standards and guidelines have been adopted by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

1989 revision. 99pp. 5 copies $37.50; Single copy $20.00
CEC Member Price, $16.00

No. P334 1988 Special Education Yearbook

Edited by June B. Jordan
The Yearbook is organized into four main sections: (1) General Information papers, (2) U.S. Statistics on Exceptional Children Served, (3) Annual Awards, and (4) Directory Information.

The 1988 Yearbook builds on the 1987 volume and, wherever possible, the information has been updated. The current status of special education in Canada is reported in a paper in Section I.

Also included is a state-of-the-art paper by James E. Ysseldyke, on The Future of Research in Special Education.

1989. 219pp. ISBN 0–86586–185–4. CEC/ERIC
$26.55; **CEC Member Price, $21.25**

Computer Search Reprints

$16.00; **CEC Member Price, $12.80**

No. C545	International Trends in Special Education 6/88
No. C556	Child Abuse (Research) 5/87
No. C558	Child Abuse: Policies and Programs 10/87
No. C561	Suspension and Expulsion of Handicapped Students 11/87

Imprinted Products and Jewelry

a.
b.
c.
d.
e.
f.
g.
h.
i.
j.
k.

B800	c.	Pocket Folders (package of 5)	$ 5.75
B802	d.	Note Pads (package of 8)	6.80
B803	a.	Portfolio	6.50
B804	b.	Coffee Mug	5.50
B805	e.	Fine Tip Pens (package of 5)	3.50
B807	f.	Brushed Steel Ball Point Pens	6.50
B810	g.	CEC Thank You Notes (package of 25)	7.50
B811	h.	CEC Note paper (package of 25)	7.50
B820	i.	Member Lapel Tac	15.00
B821		Branch Past President Lapel Tac	15.00
B822		Federation Past President Lapel Tac	15.00
B823		Division Past President Lapel Tac	15.00
B824		Past Governor Lapel Tac	15.00
B825		Student Association Officer Lapel Tac	15.00
B827	j.	Chapter Past President Lapel Tac	15.00
B828	k.	Chapter Officer Lapel Tac (red)	15.00
B829	k.	Federation Officer Lapel Tac (blue)	15.00
B830	k.	Division Officer Lapel Tac (green)	15.00

Division Books, Periodicals, and Monographs

Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders (CCBD)

Behavioral Disorders. (US ISSN 0198–7429). Quarterly. Individual Subscription $20.00; Institutional $50.00; Foreign $54.00. Single copy $12.50.

Severe Behavioral Disorders of Children and Youth—Monograph Series
Robert B. Rutherford, Jr., and Alfonso G. Prieto, Editors. 1980–1985; 1988–1989
Price per volume year, $6.40
CEC Member Price, $5.10

Programming for Adolescents with Behavioral Disorders
Sheldon Braaten and Robert Rutherford, Jr., Editors
No. D291 Vol. 1 1984.
Carol Kardash, Guest Editor
No. D312 Vol. 2 1985.
Williams Evans, Guest Editor
No. D402 Vol. 3 1987.
John W. Maag, Guest Editor
No. D405 Vol. 4 1989.
Price per issue, $11.90
CEC Member Price, $9.50

Division on Career Development (DCD)

Career Development for Exceptional Individuals (CDEI). (US ISSN 0885–7288). Twice yearly. Spring and Fall. Institutional Subscriptions only $16.00. Foreign $18.50. Single copy $8.00.

Division for Children with Communication Disorders (DCCD)

Journal of Childhood Communication Disorders. (US ISSN 0735–3170). Twice yearly. Subscription $16.00; Foreign $19.00. Single copy $10.00.

Special issues

No. D403 Making the Collaborative Consultation Model Work: The Speech Language Pathologist as Consultant and Teacher in Mainstream Education
No. D404 Communication Behaviors and Skills of Children Having Down Syndrome
$20.00; **CEC Member Price, $16.00**

Division for Early Childhood (DEC)

Journal of Early Intervention. (US ISSN 0885–3460). Quarterly. Subscription $28.00. Foreign $32.00. Single copy $10.00

Division on Mental Retardation (CEC-MR)

Education and Training in Mental Retardation. (US ISSN 0013–1237). Quarterly. Subscription $28.00. Foreign $32.00. Single copy $8.00.

No. D406 Best Practices in Mild Mental Retardation

Greg A. Robinson, James R. Patton, Edward A. Polloway, and Laurence R. Sargent, Editors
Critical issues and curricular areas in the field of mild mental retardation. Nineteen chapters complete with instructional ideas and annotated bibliographies. Excellent resource for teachers and preservice programs.
1989. 424pp. $19.00
CEC Member Price, $15.00

No. D400 Transition Issues and Directions

Robert N. Ianacone and Robert A. Stodden, Editors
Addresses the transition needs of persons with mild and severe levels of mental retardation. Covers transition phases of early years, adolescent years, and adult years. Also presented are perspectives of different disciplines or service groups involved in transition planning and programming.
1987. 152pp. ISBN 0–86586–160–9.
$14.40
CEC Member Price, $12.00

No. D297 Severe Mental Retardation: From Theory to Practice

Diane Bricker and John Filler, Editors
Examines issues of public policy, problems of families, methods of evaluation, integration of students with severe retardation, and methodological issues concerning research with severely mentally retarded persons.
1985. 293pp. ISBN 0–86586–159–5. $18.00
CEC Member Price, $14.00

No. D289 Mental Retardation: Topics of Today—Issues of Tomorrow

Edward L. Meyen, Editor
Examines contemporary trends and issues in mental retardation including policy research, severe multiple handicaps, early childhood special education, and instructional considerations.
1984. 114pp. ISBN 0–86586–158–7. $7.20
CEC Member Price, $6.00

No. D217 Educational Programming for the Severely/Profoundly Handicapped

Ed Sontag, Judy Smith, and Nick Certo, Editors
1977. 478pp. $7.20
CEC Member Price, $6.00

Order form on back cover.

Council for Educational Diagnostic Services (CEDS)

Diagnostique. (US ISSN 0737–2477). Quarterly. Subscription $24.00; Foreign $28.00. Single copy $6.00.

No. D314 Diagnostique Monograph: Perspective in Special Education Assessment
A special issue that includes chapters written by every CEC Division.
Vol. 10, Nos. 1–4, 1984–85 $17.50
CEC Member Price, $14.00

Division for Learning Disabilities (DLD)

Learning Disabilities Focus (US ISSN 0892–5011). (twice yearly) and **Learning Disabilities Research** (US ISSN 0892–502X). (twice yearly). Package subscription: Individual $25.00; Institution $32.00; Foreign $36.00. Single copy $8.00.

No. 320D Research in Learning Disabilities: Issues and Future Directions

Sharon Vaughn and Candace Bos, Editors
Described under No. S320 on page 9, this publication is available to DLD members at the special price of $15.50 (one copy per person). Use No. 320D for DLD member discount.

Teacher Education Division (TED)

Teacher Education and Special Education. Quarterly. Subscriptions: Domestic $18.00; Foreign $23.00; Library/Institutional: U.S. $22.00, Foreign $27.00; Single copy $5.00. Order from: Special Press, 11230 West Avenue, Suite 3205, San Antonio, TX 78213.

Technology and Media Division (TAM)

Journal of Special Education Technology. Quarterly. Subscriptions: Student $12.00; Individual $19.00; Institutional $30.00; Foreign $32.00. Single Copy $6.00. Order from: JSET, Peabody College, Box 328, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN 37203.

The Association for the Gifted (TAG)

Journal for the Education of the Gifted. Quarterly. Subscriptions: Individual $30.00; Institutional $40.00. Foreign $44.00. Single copy $10.00. Order from: University of North Carolina Press, P.O. Box 2288, Chapel Hill, NC 27514.

Also Available

No.	Title	Price	CEC Member Price
P323	1987 Special Education Yearbook	$26.55	$21.25
P319	Administrative Guidelines for the Implementation of Technology in Special Education	$11.70	$ 9.35
P207	Affective Education for Special Children and Youth	$ 6.90	$ 5.50
P215	An Administrator's Handbook on Designing Programs for the Gifted and Talented	$13.00	$10.40
B702	Careers in Service to Exceptional Individuals	**1-9 copies $4.00 each; 10 copies $20.00; 50 copies $50.00**	
M153	Child Abuse and Neglect: What the Educator Sees (VHS)	$40.00	$32.00
B706	Competence and Instruction: Contributions from Cognitive Psychology	$ 7.00	$ 7.00
M226A	Curriculum Alternatives for Gifted and Talented Students (VHS)	$80.00	$63.75
M189	Everybody Counts! Workshop	$20.00	$16.00
M157B	Exceptional Times: An Historical Perspective of Special Education (VHS)	$122.00	$97.75
M225A	Identification of Gifted and Talented Students (VHS)	$80.00	$63.75
B705	In Search of Excellence: Instruction that Works	$ 7.00	$ 7.00
R277	Judicial Interpretation of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act	$ 8.00	$ 6.40
P150	Learning Language at Home Level I, 3–5 years	$19.95	$15.95
B704	Litigation and Special Education	$ 7.00	$ 7.00
R630	Medically Fragile Students	$ 6.40	$ 5.10
M228A	Meeting the Needs of Gifted and Talented Students (Includes M225-M227, VHS)	$212.50	$170.00
P248	Microcomputers in Special Education: Selection and Decision Making Process	$ 8.60	$ 6.90
R622	Policy Issues Relating to the Management of Students with Communicable Diseases	$ 6.40	$ 5.10
B700	Special Education and Professional Standards (Packet of 20 reprints)	$10.00	$10.00
M227A	Social and Emotional Development of Gifted and Talented Students (VHS)	$80.00	$63.75
P143	Your Gifted Child and You	$ 9.00	$7.20

Ordering Information

Payment:	Orders for less than $10 must be prepaid by check (U.S. dollars only). Orders over $10 may be billed or paid by VISA or MasterCard.
Purchase Orders:	Institutions, bookstores, wholesalers, and jobbers should accompany credit orders with purchase order or voucher numbers.
Terms:	Net 30 days from date of invoice.
Quantity Discounts:	Discounts on quantity orders of the same title shipped to one address are as follows: 10–49 copies, 20%; 50 or more, 25%.
Member Discounts:	Orders must include Member Identification Number to qualify for member discount. Quantity discounts supersede member discounts.
Shipping:	Prices include 4th class postage and handling. Allow 4–6 weeks for delivery. For first class postage, add 10% of the total price of order.
Canadian Orders:	All orders shipped 4th class surface mail. For air, add 25%. Credit card orders will be charged at the current rate of exchange.
Foreign Orders:	Foreign orders must be prepaid with U.S. dollar drafts. Prices include surface delivery. For air mail, add 40% to total cost of order.
Returns:	Items must be returned within 120 days of date of invoice in resalable condition as determined by our Order Fulfillment Department. A 25% restocking fee, calculated on list price, will be charged. Credit memos will be issued for returns. Returns must include packing slip or copy of invoice with a statement of the reason for return.
Claims:	Upon delivery, merchandise should be checked against the packing slip and discrepancies reported in full detail **in writing immediately.** Claims for incomplete orders or damaged books will not be accepted after eight weeks from the date of invoice.
Previewing:	Media ordered for the purpose of previewing will be billed as a regular purchase. A 15% handling fee calculated on list price will be charged on all returns. Items must be returned within 30 days of date of invoice in resalable condition as determined by our Order Fulfillment Department.
Examination Copies:	Books being considered for course adoption can be sent on a 60-day approval with invoice. If an order is received for at least 10 books within 60 days, credit will be given for examination copy if order is accompanied by original invoice. If no quantity order is placed, the invoice should be paid as specified or the book should be returned postage paid in salable condition.

Index/Order Form

The Council for Exceptional Children
1920 Association Drive, Dept. C S 9 0
Reston, Virginia 22091-1589
703/620-3660; FAX 703/264-9494

Date: __________ Purchase Order # __________

Bill to: __________

Mail To: __________

Order taken from: __________

CEC Member # __________

Name: __________

Daytime Phone: __________

Payment Enclosed (U.S. Dollars) ☐

VISA __________ MasterCard __________

Card # __________

Expiration Date: __________

Signature: __________

QTY.	#	TITLE	PRICE	MEMBER PRICE
	P323	1987 Special Education Yearbook, page 14	$ 26.55	$ 21.25
	P334	1988 Special Education Yearbook, 12	$ 26.55	$ 21.25
	P319	Administrative Guidelines for the Implementation of Technology in Special Education, 14	$ 11.70	$ 9.35
	P215	An Administrator's Handbook on Designing Programs for the Gifted and Talented, 14	$ 15.00	$ 12.00
	P207	Affective Education for Special Children and Youth, 14	$ 6.90	$ 5.50
	P306	Alternative Futures in Special Education, 9	$ 21.25	$ 17.00
	R624	American Indian Exceptional Children and Youth, 6	$ 8.50	$ 6.80
	R259	Assessment, Placement, and Programming of Bilingual Exceptional Pupils: A Practical Approach, 6	$ 8.00	$ 6.40
	P260	Attitudes and Attitude Change in Special Education, 9	$ 22.95	$ 18.35
	D406	Best Practices in Mild Mental Retardation, 13	$ 19.00	$ 15.00
	P333	Beyond Drill and Practice, 10	$ 18.00	$ 14.40
	B702	Careers in Service to Exceptional Individuals, 14	Quantity Priced	
	R622	CEC Report—Policy Issues Relating to the Management of Students with Communicable Diseases, 14	$ 6.40	$ 5.10
	M153	Child Abuse and Neglect: What the Educator Sees, 14	$ 40.00	$ 32.00
	P330	College Planning for Gifted Students, 8	$ 18.50	$ 14.80
	D404	Communication Behaviors and Skills of Children Having Down Syndrome, 13	$ 20.00	$ 16.00
	B706	Competence and Instruction: Contributions from Cognitive Psychology, 14	$ 7.00	
	M226A	Curriculum Alternatives for Gifted and Talented Students, VHS format, 14	$ 80.00	$ 63.75
	B703	Curriculum-Based Assessment, 10	$ 7.00	
	D314	Diagnostique Monograph: Perspectives in Special Education Assessment, 12	$ 17.50	$ 14.00
	P325	Early Childhood Special Education: Birth to Three, 6	$ 27.00	$ 21.60
	R232	Education of Culturally and Linguistically Different Exceptional Children, 6	$ 10.00	$ 8.00
	D217	Educational Programming for the Severely Profoundly Handicapped, 13	$ 7.20	$ 6.00
	R621	Educational Services to Handicapped Students with Limited English Proficiency, 6	$ 10.00	$ 8.00
	M189	Everybody Counts! A Workshop Manual to Increase Awareness of Handicapped People, 14	$ 20.00	$ 16.00
	R620	Exceptional Asian Children and Youth, 6	$ 9.00	$ 7.20
	M157B	Exceptional Times (VHS), 14	$122.00	$ 97.75
	P328	Flexible Pacing for Able Learners, 8	$ 12.50	$ 10.00
	E105	Flyer File on Gifted Learners, 8	$ 22.50	$ 18.00
	M225A	Identification of Gifted and Talented Students, VHS format, 14	$ 80.00	$ 63.75
	B705	In Search of Excellence: Instruction that Works, 14	$ 7.00	
	P293	Integration of Students with Severe Handicaps into Regular Schools, 10	$ 18.00	$ 14.45
	P321	Job Success for Handicapped Youth: A Social Protocol Curriculum, 7	$ 12.50	$ 10.00
	R277	Judicial Interpretation of the Education for all Handicapped Children Act, 14	$ 8.00	$ 6.40
	P150	Learning Language at Home Level I, 14	$ 19.95	$ 15.95
	P180R	Life Centered Career Education: A Competency Based Approach, 7	$ 19.50	$ 15.60
	M181R	Life Centered Career Education: Trainer's Manual, 7	$150.00	$120.00
	M181V	Life Centered Career Education: Videotape, 7	$ 62.50	$ 50.00
	P303	Life Centered Career Education Activity Book I, 7	$ 12.50	$ 10.00
	P304	Life Centered Career Education Activity Book II, 7	$ 12.50	$ 10.00
	B704	Litigation and Special Education, 14	$ 7.00	

QTY.	#	TITLE	PRICE	MEMBER PRICE
	D403	Making the Collaborative Consultation Model Work: The Speech Language Pathologist as Consultant and Teacher in Mainstream Education, 13	$ 20.00	$ 16.00
	R630	Medically Fragile Students, 14	$ 6.40	$ 5.10
	M228A	Meeting the Needs of Gifted and Talented Students, 3 VHS videocassettes, 14	$212.50	$170.00
	B711	Meeting the Multicultural Needs of Hispanic Students, 6	$ 7.00	
	D289	Mental Retardation Topics of Today—Issues of Tomorrow, 13	$ 7.20	$ 6.00
	P248	Microcomputers in Special Education: Selection and Decision Making Process, 14	$ 8.60	$ 6.90
	R622	Policy Issues Relating to the Management of Students with Communicable Diseases, 14	$ 6.40	$ 5.10
	P268	A Practical Guide to Counseling the Gifted, 8	$ 12.50	$ 10.00
	P327	Preparation for Special Education Hearings, 12	$ 10.00	$ 8.00
	B700	Professional Standards (20 reprints), 14	$ 10.00	
	D___	Programming for Adolescents with Behavioral Disorders, 13	$ 11.90	$ 9.52
	P196	P.L. 94–142, Section 504, and P.L. 99–457—Understanding What They Are and Are Not, 12	Quantity Priced	
	M317	P.L. 99–457—The Next Step Forward for Handicapped Children, 11	$156.25	$125.00
	P258	Reflections on Growing Up Disabled, 9	$ 12.50	$ 10.00
	S320	Research in Learning Disabilities: Issues and Future Directions, 9	$ 30.00	$ 24.00
	P300	The School Psychologist and the Exceptional Child, 9	$ 21.75	$ 17.40
	P326	Schools and the Culturally Diverse Exceptional Student: Promising Practices and Future Directions, 8	$ 18.00	$ 14.40
	P322	Secondary Special Education: A Guide to Promising Public School Programs, 10	$ 20.00	$ 16.00
	D___	Severe Behavioral Disorders of Children and Youth—Monograph Series, 13	$ 6.40	$ 5.10
	D297	Severe Mental Retardation: Theory to Practice, 13	$ 18.00	$ 14.40
	M227A	Social and Emotional Development of Gifted and Talented Students, VHS format, 14	$ 80.00	$ 63.75
	R315	A Special Educator's Perspective on Interfacing Special and General Education, 9	$ 6.40	$ 5.10
	R628	Standards and Guidelines for Curriculum Excellence in Personnel Preparation Programs, (see p. 12)	Quantity Priced	
	R631	Standards for Programs Involving the Gifted and Talented, 8	$ 6.25	$ 5.00
	B709	Students at Risk, 10	$ 7.00	
	P305	Teaching Learning Disabled Students at the Secondary School Level, 10	$ 10.00	$ 8.00
	M324	Teaching Mildly Handicapped Students: Video Training in Effective Instruction, 11	$180.50	$144.50
	M324E	Teaching Mildly Handicapped Students in the Elementary School: Video Training in Effective Instruction, 11	$ 95.50	$ 76.50
	M324S	Teaching Mildly Handicapped Students in the Secondary School: Video Training in Effective Instruction, 11	$ 95.50	$ 76.50
	B707	Transition from School to Adult Life, 7	$ 7.00	
	D400	Transition Issues and Directions, 13	$ 14.40	$ 12.00
	P273	The Underserved: Our Young Gifted Children, 8	$ 20.00	$ 16.00
	P200	Understanding Child Variance, 10	$ 16.00	$ 12.80
	S329	Understanding and Conducting Qualitative Research, 9	$ 19.50	$ 15.60
	M199G	Video Training Workshops on Child Variance, 11	$690.00	$552.00
	P143	Your Gifted Child and You, 14	$ 9.00	$ 7.20
	P331	Youth Suicide—What the Educator Should Know, 9	$ 18.50	$ 14.80

Continued on next page

Index/Order Form *continued*

Audio Tapes

Qty.	No.	Title	Price: $13.00/$10.40
______	M10	Four Paradigms of Social Scientific Thought	
______	M11	Spec. Ed. and Disability Functionalist View	
______	M12	Spec. Ed. and Disability Structuralist View	
______	M13	Spec. Ed. and Disability Interpretivist View	
______	M14	Spec. Ed. and Disability Humanist View	
______	M15	Using the Radical Structuralist Paradigm and L.D.	
______	M16	Holism or: There is no Substitute for Real Life	
______	M17	Toward a Metatheory of School Organization	
______	M18	Managing Change and Team Building	
______	M19	Accommodating for Student Variance	
______	M20	Effective Supervision	
______	M21	Alternative Views and Theoretical Applications in Special Education (Tapes M10-M17)	$85.00/$68.00

Computer Search Reprints

Qty.	No.	Title	Price: $16.00/$12.80
______	C521	Research on the Effectiveness of Mainstreaming	
______	C522	Research on the Effectiveness of Early Childhood Education for Handicapped Children	
______	C539	Programs for Handicapped or High-Risk Infants	
______	C543	Facilitating Mainstreaming: Guidelines for Teachers and Principals	
______	C546	Learning Disabilities: Definitions, Assessment, and Eligibility Criteria	
______	C548	Cognitive Strategies for the Mildly Handicapped	
______	C552	Attention Deficit Disorders and Hyperactivity	
______	C553	Gifted and Learning Disabled	
______	C557	Future Trends in Special Education	
______	C559	Research on the Effectiveness of Gifted Education	
______	C562	Preschool Gifted Children	
______	C563	Preschool Programs for Handicapped Children	
______	C564	Educating Emotionally Disturbed Children and Youth	
______	C565	Underachieving Gifted Students	
______	C566	Teaching Learning Disabled Elementary Children	
______	C567	Teaching Learning Disabled Adolescents	
______	C568	Identification and Assessment of Exceptional Bilingual	
______	C569	Teaching Gifted Elementary School Children	
______	C577	Teaching Black Students Who Have Handicaps	
______	C578	Programs for Secondary Gifted Students	
______	___	______________________________	
______	___	______________________________	

Super Search Reprints

Qty.	No.	Title	Price: $22.50/$18.00
______	C571	Serious Emotional Disturbance and Social Maladjustment	
______	C572	Preventive Discipline and Behavior Management	
______	C573	Adapted Physical Education	
______	C574	Prereferral Intervention for Students with Learning and Behavior Problems	
______	C575	Peer Support and Cooperative Learning for Accommodating Student Variance	
______	C576	Curriculum Based Assessment and Curriculum Based Measurement	

Periodicals

Qty.	Title	Domestic Subscription	Single Copy
______	Behavioral Disorders	$50.00 (Inst.)	$12.50
______	Career Development for Exceptional Individuals	16.00	8.00
______	Diagnostique	24.00	6.00
______	Education and Training in Mental Retardation	28.00	8.00
______	Journal of Childhood Communication Disorders	16.00	10.00
______	Journal of Early Intervention	28.00	10.00
______	Learning Disabilities Focus and Learning Disabilities Research	32.00 (Inst.)	8.00
______	Exceptional Children	35.00	7.00
______	TEACHING Exceptional Children	20.00	7.00
______	Exceptional Child Education Resources	75.00	20.00

Infopackets

Qty.	No.	Title	Price: $12.50/$10.00
______	E101	Handicapped and At-Risk Children	
______	E102	Teaching Students Who Have Handicaps	
______	E103	Administration and Supervision in Special Education	

CEC Imprinted Products

Qty.	No.	Item	Price
______	B800	Pocket Folders (package of 5)	$ 5.75
______	B802	Note Pads (package of 8)	6.80
______	B803	Portfolio	6.50
______	B804	Coffee Mug	5.50
______	B805	Fine Tip Pens (package of 5)	3.50
______	B807	Brushed Steel Ball Point Pens	6.50
______	B810	CEC Thank You Notes	7.50
______	B811	CEC Note Paper	7.50
______	B820	Member Lapel Tac	15.00
______	B821	Branch Past President Lapel Tac	15.00
______	B822	Federation Past President Lapel Tac	15.00
______	B823	Division Past President Lapel Tac	15.00
______	B824	Past Governor Lapel Tac	15.00
______	B825	Student Association Officer Lapel Tac	15.00
______	B827	Chapter Past President Lapel Tac	15.00
______	B828	Chapter Officer Lapel Tac	15.00
______	B829	Federation Officer Lapel Tac	15.00
______	B830	Division Officer Lapel Tac	15.00
______	B831	International Officer Lapel Tac	15.00

The Council for Exceptional Children
Department C S 9 0
1920 Association Drive
Reston, Virginia 22091-1589

Non-Profit
Organization
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Herndon, Va.
Permit No. 1575

ꟼeproduction Release Form

ᴺT IDENTIFICATION

ᴜCTION RELEASE

ꞏo disseminate as widely as possible timely
cant materials of interest to the educationa
documents announced in the monthly ab
nal of the ERIC system Resources in Educa
are usually made available to users in mi-
nd paper copy (or microfiche only) and sold
e ERIC Document Reproduction Service
.redit is given to the source of each docu
eproduction release is granted one of the fol-
ices is affixed to the document

ON TO
E THIS
AS BEEN
ED BY

NAME
ZATION

PRIATE

A
AL
INFOR
ENTER

PERMISSION TO
REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL IN MICRO
FICHE ONLY HAS
BEEN
GRANTED BY

(PERSONAL NAME
OR ORGANIZATION

AS APPROPRIATE)

TO THE EDUCA
TIONAL
RESOURCES INFOR
MATION CENTER
(ERIC)

266

is granted to reproduce the identified doc
CHECK ONE of the options below and sign
the other side

OR ☐ Microfiche
(4" × 6" film)
reproduction
only

will be processed as indicated if quality
ission to reproduce is granted but neither
documents will be processed in both
paper copy

Signature Required

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce this document as indicated on the other side. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction of microfiche by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature ____________________
Printed name ____________________
Organization ____________________
____
Position ____________________
Address ____________________
____
Tel No __________ Zip Code __________

III **DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION**
(Non-ERIC Source)

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC or if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of a document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents which cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher Distributor ____________________
____
Address ____________________
Price Per Copy ____________________
Quantity Price ____________________

IV **REFERRAL TO COPYRIGHT REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER**

If the right to grant reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address

____
____
____

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

ERIC Clearinghouses on

Adult, Career, and Vocational Education
Ohio State University
Center on Education and
Training for Employment
1900 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210-1090
Telephone (614) 292-4353
(800) 848-4815

Counseling and Personnel Services
University of Michigan
School of Education, Room 2108
610 East University Street
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1259
Telephone (313) 764-9492

Educational Management
University of Oregon
1787 Agate St
Eugene, Oregon 97403-5207
Telephone (503) 686-5043

Elementary and Early Childhood Education
University of Illinois
College of Education
805 W. Pennsylvania Ave
Urbana, Illinois 61801-4897
Telephone (217) 333-1386

Handicapped and Gifted Children
Council for Exceptional Children
1920 Association Drive
Reston, Virginia 22091-1589
Telephone (703) 620-3660

Higher Education
George Washington University
One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Suite 630
Washington, D.C. 20036-1183
Telephone (202) 296-2597

Information Resources
Syracuse University
School of Information
Studies
Huntington Hall, Room 030
Syracuse, New York
13244-2340
Telephone (315) 443-3640

Junior Colleges
University of California at
Los Angeles
Mathematical Sciences
Building, Room 8118
405 Hilgard Avenue
Los Angeles, California
90024-1564
Telephone (213) 825-393

Languages and Linguistics
Center for Applied Linguistics
1118 22nd Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20037-0037
Telephone (202) 429-9

Reading and Communication Skills
Indiana University
Smith Research Center
2805 East 10th Street, Suite 15
Bloomington, Indiana 47408-2373
Telephone (812) 855-584

Rural Education and Small Schools
Appalachia Educational Laboratory
1031 Quarrier Street
P.O. Box 1348
Charleston, West Virginia 25325-1348
Telephone Out WV (800) 624-912
In WV (800) 344-6646

Science, Mathematics, and Environmental Education
Ohio State University
1200 Chambers Road, Room 310
Columbus, Ohio 43212-1792
Telephone (614) 292-671

Social Studies/Social Science Education
Indiana University
Social Studies Development Center
2805 E. Tenth Street, Suite 12
Bloomington, Indiana 47405-2373
Telephone (812) 855-3838

Teacher Education
American Association of Colleges for
Teacher Education
One Dupont Circle, N.W., Suite 61
Washington, DC 20036-2412
Telephone (202) 293-24

Tests, Measurement, and Evaluation
American Institutes for Research
Washington Research Center
3333 K St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20007-3591
Telephone (202) 342-5

Urban Education
Teachers College, Columbia
University
Institute for Urban and Minority Education
Main Hall, Room 300, Box 40
525 West 120th Street
New York, New York 10027-9998
Telephone (212) 678-3433

Access ERIC
Aspen Systems Corporation
1600 Research Boulevard
Rockville, Maryland 2085
Telephone (301) 251
(800) [illegible]

ERIC CEC
1920 Association Drive
Reston, VA 22091-1589

We Deliver
ERIC

Special Education Information

ERIC Clearinghouse on
Handicapped and Gifted Chil

The Council for Exceptional Childre
1920 Association Drive, Reston, VA 2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RIC Clearinghouse
Handicapped
d Gifted Children

ere do you find...

culum guides for young gifted children?
es for mainstreaming handicapped
dents in vocational education classes?
date research on special education
es?

to the ERIC Database for these and resources.

do you access the ERIC tabase?

the ERIC Clearinghouse on
capped and Gifted Children or any of the
RIC Clearinghouses that compose the ERIC
(Each Clearinghouse has a different
tional focus.)

nat Is the Connection Between RIC and CEC?

ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and
Children focuses on special education
mation. The Council for Exceptional
dren has been the host organization for this
nghouse since its inception in 1966. CEC is
only professional organization dedicated to
oving the quality of education for all
eptional children, both handicapped and
d.

hat is ERIC?

Educational Resources Information
is:

federally funded education information
tem
database of over 400,000 journal
tations and 300,000 education re
ment abstracts
urce of books and pamphlets abo
of education

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children gathers and disseminates educational information on all disabilities and the gifted, across all age levels. ERIC-CEC performs the following services:

Database Building

- Acquiring, selecting, abstracting and indexing professional literature on disabilities and giftedness for the ERIC database—including journal articles and unpublished or informally published documents, such as program descriptions and teaching guides.

Information Synthesis

- Developing Publications—including digests, research summaries, books, and reports that summarize or synthesize information on current and emerging topics.
- Information Services—providing information users with references and referrals.

How Can You Access ERIC?

—Through the Clearinghouses

One way to use the ERIC system is to contact the ERIC Clearinghouse that covers your topic. (See the list of clearinghouses on the back of this brochure.)

The Clearinghouse response may be:

- pamphlets or flyers
- bibliographies of selected publications
- suggestions for database searching
- referral to other sources of information

—Through a Local Library

A university, professional, or public library near your home probably has access to the ERIC database, which contains information on over 700,000 documents and journal articles. The librarian can help you find the information you need by using the ERIC reference publications or by doing a computerized search of the database.

—Through Online Search Services

Using a computer equipped with a modem, anyone can access the ERIC database from any location in the country (your home, your office, your school).

What are the ERIC Reference Publications?

Current Index to Journals in Education and *Resources in Education*—documents added to the ERIC database are announced each month in these publications.

- *Current Index to Journals in Education* (CIJE) publishes annotations of articles from over 700 education periodicals. Most articles are available from:

  UMI Article Clearinghouse
  University Microfilms International
  300 N. Zeeb Road
  Ann Arbor, MI 48106
  1-800-732-0616

- *Resources in Education (RIE)* publishes abstracts of a variety of unpublished literature—research reports, curriculum guides, program descriptions, state-of-the-art papers, and conference proceedings.

Microfiche and paper copies of most of the source documents abstracted in *RIE* are available from:

ERIC Reproduction Service (EDRS)
3900 Wheeler Ave.
Alexandria, VA 22304-6409
1-800-227-3742

Most large libraries have the ERIC microfiche collection, which consists of microfiche copies of almost all of the documents announced in *RIE*.

What Information Is Available from ERIC-CEC?

Your information needs can frequently be met with either: (1) an ERIC-CEC product, or (2) a database search.

1. **Products:**
- Publications—books, monographs, or reports
- Digests—two-page summaries of current high-interest topics. Minibibliographies, Research Briefs, Issue Briefs, and Directories of currently funded research
- Topical Infopackets

Request catalog and product flyer for complete list of titles.

2. **ERIC and ECER Database Searches:**
- Computer Search Reprints—Collections of carefully selected abstracts on over 45 topics of current interest. Search reprints are updated frequently and contain abstracts from both the ERIC and ECER databases. ECER (Exceptional Child Education Resources) is CEC's public online database that supplements the ERIC database with abstracts of commercially published books, dissertations, and additional journal articles in special education. The average search reprint includes 100 citations.
  Cost: $16.00 per search reprint
- Custom Computer Searches—Online searches of the ERIC and/or ECER database(s) customized to meet specific user needs.
  Cost: One database (ERIC *or* ECER) $45—for up to 50 abstracts
  Two databases (ECER *and* ERIC) $62.50—for up to 100 abstracts
- ERIC Minisearches—Abbreviated customized searches of the ERIC database using CD-ROM, includes abstracts of both RIE and CIJE documents. This is a new service designed to help users do preliminary searching. Minisearches are especially suitable for locating information on emerging topics and topics where few resources exist.
  Cost: $15.00 per minisearch (10 citations with abstracts or 25 citations without abstracts)

Special CEC Member Rates are available on all products and searches. Prepayment for search services is required unless a purchase order number is provided. VISA or MasterCard may be used. Please note that orders billed to institutions must be billed at the regular rate.

To initiate a search, call ERIC-CEC at 703/620-3660 and ask for an Information Specialist.

To receive additional brochures about ERIC-CEC products and services, write and ask to have your name added to the mailing list for the ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children.

What Other ERIC-CEC Ser Are Available?

- Public access to the ERIC-CEC Re Room.
- Scheduled workshops on how to u

How Can You Contribute t ERIC Database?

If you have recently written a paper r
the education of the gifted or of peop
disabilities—such as a research repo
program description or evaluation, a r
the literature, a curriculum guide, or a
conference paper—your work can be
permanently available and accessible
ERIC. Documents submitted to ERIC
evaluated according to the following

- Sound methodology (for research
- Adequate references.
- Currency.
- Content generalizability to other se
- Clear writing style.
- Substantive information (5 pages o

*For further information, call ERIC-CE
703/620-3660 and ask for the Acqui
Coordinator.*

To submit your document, please se
- Two copies with CLEAR, DARK ty

and

- A completed Reproduction Releas found on the back of this brochure *Reproduction Release form does preclude publication elsewhere.)*

Send to: Acquisitions Coordinator
ERIC Clearinghouse on Ha
and Gifted Children
The Council for Exceptiona
1920 Association Drive
Reston, VA 22091-1589

If your document is selected for incl
ERIC database, a complimentary mi
the document and two copies of the
appears in *Resources in Education*
sent to you.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children
THE COUNCIL FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN
1920 Association Drive • Reston, VA 22091-1589
FAX (703) 264-9494

Product Flyer

April 1990

ERIC Flyer Files

A brand new concept in information packaging. Preprinted file folders ready to store in your file drawer. Each 2- to 4-page digest or resource list is printed on heavy stock suitable for use as a duplication master. $20.50 (CEC Member Price **$18.00**)

___ E105 Flyer File on Gifted Students

Career Planning • College Planning • Defining Giftedness • Developing Leadership • Discovering Interests & Talents Through Summer Experience • Fostering Academic Creativity • Fostering the Postsecondary Aspirations of Gifted Urban Minority Students • Flexible Pacing • Giftedness and Learning Disabilities • Guiding the Gifted Reader • Helping Adolescents Adjust to Giftedness • Helping the Highly Gifted • Nurturing Giftedness in Young Children • Mentor Relationships • Personal Computers • Selected Readings for Parents & Teachers • Stress Management • Talented Minority Language Students • Supporting Gifted Education Through Advocacy • Underachieving Gifted

INFOpackets

New and improved, INFOpackets are collections of ERIC digests and ERIC/OSEP research summaries and briefs. These packets are designed to provide concise information on topics related to the education of students with disabilities.

Since these materials are in the public domain they may be duplicated for a variety of uses. (Parent handouts, newsletter supplements, mail enclosures, and vertical file resources.) INFOpacket materials are also printed on quality stock for a longer "life" as masters. $10.00 (CEC Member Price $8.00).

___ E107 Handicapping Conditions

Communication Disorders • Disabilities: Overview • Down Syndrome • Emotional Disturbances • Learning Disabilities • Mental Retardation • Physical Disabilities and Health Impairments • Severe Disabilities • Specialized Health Care Needs • Visual Impairments

___ E108 Learning Disabilities

Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD) • College Planning • Competency Testing and Employability • Computer Technology • Dyslexia • Overview • Post-School Status • Readings About Children and Youth • Stress Management • Teaching Children with Attention Deficit Disorder

___ E109 Preschool Children with Handicaps

Cost Efficiency of Early Education • Does Early Intervention Help? • Early Identification • Early Intervention For Infants and Toddlers—A Team Effort • Effectiveness of Special Education • Orientation and Mobility for Blind Infants • Preschool Services • Rights and Responsibilities of Parents • Training Older Siblings to Enhance the Communications of Infants and Toddlers with Down Syndrome • Using Computer Technology

___ E110 Delivery of Special Education: Administrative Concerns

Disciplinary Exclusion • Educating Exceptional Children • Effectiveness of Mainstreaming • Finance Formulas • Graduation Requirements • Least Restrictive Environment • Prereferral Intervention • Dropouts • Statistics and Trends • Student-Teacher Ratios

___ E111 Instructional Strategies for Students with Cognitive Disabilities

Academic Learning Time and Student Achievement • Adapting Instructional Materials for Mainstreamed Students • Brain Research: Implications • Critical Presentation Skills • Curriculum-Based Assessment • Instructional Practices • Lesson Structure • Peer Tutoring and Small Group Instruction • Social Integration: Cooperative Goal Structuring • Using Curriculum-Based Measurement to Select Instructional Strategies

___ E112 Social Integration of Children and Youth with Disabilities

Adaptive Behavior • Being at Ease with Handicapped Children • Developing Social Vocational Skills • Fostering Peer Acceptance • Guidelines for Reporting and Writing • Managing Inappropriate Behavior • Peer and Cross Age Teaching • Self-Management • Self-Management to Increase On-Task Behavior • Severe Disabilities

___ E113 Computer Technology in Special Education

Access • Acquiring Special Education Information • Artificial Intelligence • Computers and Writing • Guide for Parents • Guide for Teachers • Interactive Video • Learner-Centered Software • Learning Disabilities • Selecting Software

ERIC/OSEP Issue Briefs

Issue Briefs are summaries of research projects that help practitioners translate research into practice. $5.00 each.

No.	Title
___ E1	Adapting Instructional Materials for Mainstreamed Students
___ E2	Assistive Technology Design in Special Education

THE COUNCIL FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN OPERATES THE ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON HANDICAPPED AND GIFTED CHILDREN AND THE ERIC/OSEP SPECIAL PROJECT ON INTERAGENCY INFORMATION DISSEMINATION UNDER CONTRACTS WITH THE OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT AND THE OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

ERIC/OSEP Directories of Ongoing Research

This series of directories consists of a master directory and fourteen topical directories. Each subject specific directory provides basic information and abstracts of research projects currently funded by the Division of Innovation and Development, Office of Special Education Programs, U.S. Department of Education. A shipping and handling fee of $5.00 is charged for each directory.

No.	Title
___ E1900	Master Directory
___ E1901	Assessment
___ E1902	Elementary Grades
___ E1903	Infants and Preschool Children
___ E1904	Instruction
___ E1905	Language
___ E1906	Least Restrictive Environment
___ E1907	Parents
___ E1908	Pupil Outcomes
___ E1909	Service Delivery Systems
___ E1910	Social Skills
___ E1911	Subject Matter
___ E1912	Teacher Training
___ E1913	Technology
___ E1914	Vocational and Secondary Education and Transition to Adult Life

Computer Search Reprints

Computer search reprints are bibliographies containing abstracts from both the ERIC and ECER databases. Dates in parentheses indicate time of creation or most recent update. Prices: $16.00 each, $12.80 to CEC members.

No.	Title
___ C521	Research on the Effectiveness of Mainstreaming (10/88)
___ C522	Research on the Effectiveness of Early Childhood Education for Handicapped Children (7/88)
___ C527	Severely Handicapped Students: Curriculum Guides and Teaching Methods (4/90)
___ C533	Transition from School to Work for Youth with Handicaps (3/90)
___ C539	Programs for Handicapped or High Risk Infants (1/89)
___ C542	Brain Research: Implications for Education of Exceptional Children (4/89)
___ C543	Facilitating Mainstreaming: Guidelines for Teachers and Principals (4/89)
___ C544	Identification of the Gifted (3/90)
___ C546	Learning Disabilities: Definitions, Assessment, and Eligibility Criteria (8/89)
___ C548	Cognitive Strategies for the Mildly Handicapped (3/90)
___ C550	Changing Attitudes Toward the Handicapped (3/90)
___ C552	Attention Deficit Disorders and Hyperactivity (1/89)
___ C553	Gifted and Learning Disabled (12/89)
___ C554	Creativity Programs and Practices (4/90)
___ C555	Culturally Diverse Gifted Students (4/90)
___ C557	Future Trends in Special Education (1/89)
___ C559	Research on Effectiveness of Gifted Education (6/89)
___ C562	Preschool Gifted Children (3/90)
___ C563	Preschool Programs for Handicapped Children (6/89)
___ C564	Educating Students Who Have an Emotional Disturbance (4/90)
___ C565	Underachieving Gifted Students (7/89)
___ C566	Teaching Learning Disabled Elementary School Children (4/88)
___ C567	Teaching Learning Disabled Adolescents (2/90)
___ C568	Identification and Assessment of Exceptional Bilingual Students (5/88)
___ C569	Teaching Gifted Elementary School Children (3/90)
___ C570	Learning Disabled Adults: Education, Employment, and Social Adjustment (9/88)
___ C577	Teaching Black Students Who Have Handicaps (8/89)
___ C578	Programs for Secondary Gifted Students (8/89)
___ C579	Efficacy of P.L. 94-142 and the Implementation of the LRE Concept (4/90)
___ C580	The Regular Education Initiative: Rationales For and Against (4/90)
___ C581	Practices Consistent With the Regular Education Initiative (4/90)

Super Search Reprints

Super Search Reprints include up to 150 abstracts plus introductory material. These more extensive reprints cover major issues or practices on the topic. Prices: $22.50; CEC Member Price: $18.00.

No.	Title
___ C571	Serious Emotional Disturbance and Social Maladjustment (3/90)
___ C572	Preventive Discipline and Behavior Management (8/89)
___ C573	Adaptive Physical Education(12/89)
___ C574	Prereferral Intervention for Students with Learning and Behavior Problems (12/89)
___ C575	Peer Support and Cooperative Learning for Accommodating Student Variance (12/89)
___ C576	Curriculum Based Assessment and Curriculum Based Measurement (4/90)

Please indicate quantity next to each product. Minimum order is $5.00 prepaid (U.S. Funds). Orders $10.00 or more may be billed or paid by VISA or MasterCard. Send order to The Council for Exceptional Children, Dept. K00440, 1920 Association Drive, Reston, VA 22091-1589, Telephone 703/264-9467, FAX 703/264-9494.

Name ________________________

Address ________________________

City ____________ State ______ Zip ________

CEC Member ID No. ________________________

Check one:

VISA ______

______

Card # ________________________

Expiration Date ________________________

Bank # ________________________

APPENDIX Q

MONTGOMERY/VICTORIA PROJECT
SOCIAL PREVOCATIONAL INFORMATION BATTERY
GOALS, DOMAINS, AND CONTENT AREAS

Table 1
SPIB GOALS, DOMAINS, AND CONTENT AREAS

GOAL	DOMAIN	CONTENT AREAS 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
ECONOMIC SELF SUFFICIENCY	PURCHASING HABITS	Methods and implications of comparative shopping	Relationship between type of store and type of merchandise available	Use of newspaper as a purchasing aid	Relationship between weight and cost	General purchasing terminology	Awareness of sales tax and the ability to compute it	Advantages and disadvantages of quantity buying	Ability to compare newspaper ads and determine best buys	
	BUDGETING	Time buying and its relationship to budgeting	Impact of borrowing on a budget	Good judgment and arithmetic skills necessary for appropriate salary allocation	Concept, consequences, and prevention of overspending	Concepts and implications of credit ratings	Relationships between budgeting and savings	Impact of salary change on a budget	Distinctions between regular and irregular expenses	"Grace Periods" as they relate to payment of bills
	BANKING	Cost of checking and/or savings accounts and where they may be opened	Procedures involved in deposit or withdrawal from bank accounts	How to write and/or cash checks	Procedures and implications of properly recording and balancing check records	Basic concept of interest and general interest rates for savings accounts	Usefulness of checking accounts	Hazards of signing a blank check and problems with failure to sign completed check		
EMPLOYABILITY	JOB RELATED BEHAVIORS	Role and duties of a supervisor	Appropriate job related communications	What constitutes job completion and its implications	Appropriate work relations with fellow employees					
	JOB SEARCH SKILLS	Relationships between types of jobs and job requirements	Functions and cost of public and private job assistance agencies	Why, when, and how to complete a job application form	Job sources	Proper use of telephone with potential employers	Appropriate interview behavior	Contents and purpose of job résumé	Obtaining information from want ads	
FAMILY LIVING	HOME MANAGEMENT	Maintenance, repair and safe physical functioning of structural parts of living quarters	Safe and sanitary home living conditions	Proper food preparation and storage procedures	Appropriate laundry procedures	Functioning of home appliances	Protective and utility agencies and their function			
	PHYSICAL HEALTH	Emergency health care	Common health care practices that prevent injury, illness, or infection	Proper use of medications	Child health care practices	Importance of health care	Rudiments of body temperature			
PERSONAL	PERSONAL HYGIENE AND GROOMING	Need for regular health care	Need for body cleanliness	Consequences of poor health or inadequate personal hygiene and grooming	When and how to use body cleaning agents and grooming aids					
COMMUNICATIONS	FUNCTIONAL SIGNS	Traffic and road signs	Safety signs	Emergency signs	General information signs					

BEST COPY AVAILABLE